

62. Also, memorial of the thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

63. Also, petition of Laramie Rental-property Owners' Association, Laramie, Wyo., objecting to existing legislation on rent control or proposed extension of controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

64. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 8, 1949, stating that the conscience of the American people and liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked at the trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and voicing their condemnation of such proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Miss Jean Kennedy and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. Also, petition of Miss Marie S. Crooks and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, petition of Miss Cynthia Szymanski and 39 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

68. Also, petition of 767 residents of Jersey City, N. J., and vicinity, petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Fall River Clover Club, Inc., and the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

70. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Muncy, Pa., in opposition to the construction of steam power plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority or in any other section of the United States with funds provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

71. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3), concerning the immediate need of drastically curtailing the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

72. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council of Providence, R. I., requesting that the Congress of the United States pass and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

73. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress, providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

74. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Charlotte C. Cobb, chairman, resolutions, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to education, housing, and national loyalty adopted at this meeting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

75. Also, petition of Fred S. Mansfield, secretary, Dallas Clearing House Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging amendment to Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law authorizing and directing discontinuance of assessments so long as FDIC capital funds are not less than \$1,000,000,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

76. Also, petition of Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution asking for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

77. Also, petition of A. D. Edmonston, acting secretary, Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable consideration of H. R. 163 and H. R. 126, which would authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, we give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindnesses to us. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, and that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight path we may not stumble. Grant that this day we may fall into no errors and all our doings be righteous in Thy sight.

Blessed is the man that maketh the Lord his trust. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, delivered over the American Broadcasting Co. on Saturday, February 5, 1949.

### CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent farcical trial and subsequent conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty is further evidence of the operation of the Communist system. The Communist philosophy advocates a deliberate debasement of the dignity of the human being to the level of a common beast. How else would such a philosophy survive if each and every individual was not subjected to the domineering will of the state?

That trial was a political trial and had an imperialistic end. Obviously, in order to attain the imperialistic end, the proceedings at the trial had to be served to the outside world in such manner so as to indicate the apparent innocence of the state. Thus the cardinal was presumed to have pleaded guilty. This in itself serves as valuable propaganda for the Communist ends at home, even though it may not necessarily be accepted in a democratic country. But was it actually the cardinal who pleaded guilty? How are we to know whether Cardinal Mindszenty ever appeared at the trial? The trial was certainly not open to everyone and was not a free trial. Some say the cardinal was a victim of chemical treatment; others say he was drugged. The fact is, he is said to have confessed his guilt to some of the charges. But why could not the trial have taken on a Hollywood atmosphere and substituted a double in the cardinal's stead? That would not have been difficult to do, for we have no proof that he was there at all except that the controlled Communist press tells us that he was there. It is very likely that Cardinal Mindszenty never appeared at his trial, that he was either in a prison somewhere or was dead at the time.

It is absolutely necessary that a Communist-controlled government employ

any expedient measure to erase the life of any human being who stands opposed to that government because of its false philosophy, particularly where that government condones the outrageous extinction of Christian doctrine.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I have the honor to serve, has just reported a pension bill for World War I and World War II veterans. In my opinion the bill that has been reported has been reported without proper and due consideration by the committee. In fact, seven members of that committee walked out of the hearings this morning because of the high-handed and arbitrary tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee.

This bill provides that an individual, not having an honorable discharge, and ineligible for membership in major veterans' organizations, is still eligible to receive pension under the provisions of this bill.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that the Veterans' Committee members never saw this bill until it was presented by the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman RANKIN, this morning. Surely this House does not want to take up a bill that was only considered by the committee for seven brief minutes.

During my service on this committee I have always been sympathetic to legislation designed for the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; however, I cannot support a bill that would ultimately cost over \$6,000,000,000 per year, nor would I ask this House to do so unless the Members were sure that ample hearings had been held. If this bill is brought up after the necessary number of days, under the new rules, I sincerely urge that the membership of this House will, regardless of possible political consequences, recommit the bill to the committee for further consideration. If this is done, I can assure the Members that a pension bill will be favorably reported by the committee that will be fair and equitable to both veterans and citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] walked out on the veterans this morning and that a few uninformed, or I probably should say misinformed, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs went along with him; but a large majority of the members of the commit-

tee remained, went through the entire bill, and voted to report it out.

As to my being arbitrary, as a matter of fact, I put that question to a vote, and the committee sustained me, which put the gentleman on the spot, and that is when he walked out.

I want to say that a majority of the members of the committee voted to raise the age limit to 65 years and voted to follow the Spanish-American War veterans pension law by providing them a pension of \$90 a month—just what the Spanish War veterans are being paid now.

Mr. HUBER. Is the gentleman discussing what occurred in executive session?

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about what the gentleman spoke of here a moment ago.

The gentleman gets up here and misinforms the House, and I am trying to correct him. If the gentleman had stayed there and voted he would not have any "gripe."

We do not intend for our old veterans, when they pass the age of their earning capacity, to have to go to the poorhouse to get a meal ticket.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Eric Johnston.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in Paterson, N. J.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, and in the other an article by Roscoe Pound on the present situation in China.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former Member of the House.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., at Charleston, S. C.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times, February 12, and in the other an editorial appearing in the same newspaper with reference to the celebration of the birthday of John L. Lewis.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary for me to rise in support and corroboration of the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Arizona regarding what did happen in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning. I want the House to know that I attended every daily session of the hearings that were held on that bill, and to say that those of us who walked out, as a class, are uninformed is a reflection not upon those Members but upon the way in which those committee hearings have been held. I think that every one of us was justified in leaving a meeting of the committee. It did not operate in accordance with the rules of this House.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any desire to become entangled in any personal fight or disagreement between Members of this House, but I have been present at all committee hearings on a uniform-pension bill. I have heard the discussions on both sides. It has been fair. It has been an effort to keep faith with the men that have worn the uniform with honor in the defense of this Republic. The American Legion, the VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, and all great veterans' organizations have been given fair and courteous treatment before our committee. I introduced a bill myself, No. 5810. My chief concern is in promoting the welfare of the veterans and the American people. I trust that no veteran who has defended his country will ever be forced upon the charity of others when he becomes ill and disabled.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the committees of this House operate under the same rules as the House.

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House so provide.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know further whether this House has a right to appeal from a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Any Member has the right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.



Mr. CHUDOFF. I should like to know whether, under that ruling, members of the committee can appeal from the ruling of the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. They can.

Mr. CHUDOFF. So that the chairman of a committee who had his ruling appealed from would have no right other than to allow that appeal to go before the entire committee; is that right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House provide that the rules of the House are made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable. The Members of the House have a right to appeal from a decision of the Chair. That would also apply in a committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose a question is raised here and a roll call is asked for, and one-fifth of the Members rise and ask for a roll call, and the Chair holds that a roll call is called for, no appeal from that ruling would be in order, would it?

The SPEAKER. That would be in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. That is just what happened in the committee this morning. I demanded a roll call and asked for a showing of hands, and more than one-fifth voted for a roll call. One member tried to appeal from the decision, which, of course, was ridiculous. Then a few of them walked out, evidently to keep from going on record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was only answering the parliamentary inquiry. He does not know what happened in the committee.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the general assembly of his State.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from a soil conservation district.

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Emory Alumnus.

Mr. MCSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some statistics he has gathered relative to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter. In one instance, the Government Printing Office advises me the cost will be \$159.75 and that it will take 2¼ pages of the RECORD, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member of Congress. I am also an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, having served 5½ years—3½ years of this time overseas. I have a deep and sincere interest in the veteran.

I believe that our Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the men who served it, and who helped to save our way of life—the great American way.

I deem it a singular honor and privilege to be able to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Today the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had under consideration a general pension bill for veterans. In my opinion, the people of our country are grateful that these men were able to preserve our democratic processes and they would like to make this feeling manifest through a measure of this kind. However, even while such a measure is under consideration, we must not yield any of our democratic processes. The veteran fought to preserve our democratic way—and as a Member of Congress—it is my solemn duty to continue to fight to preserve that way. And I intend to do so unceasingly.

This opportunity I do not believe was afforded to us because of the objectionable way in which the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee conducted today's meeting.

The chairman of that committee has charged that seven members ran out on the veterans when considering the general pension bill. I take issue with that remark. My interest in the welfare of the veteran is as great as his—but I am strenuously opposed to what I regard as the undemocratic method he has used in the conduct of today's meeting. I feel that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who walked out with us, reflected a commendable attitude.

I did not walk out on the veteran. I shall never walk out on the veteran. I shall always fight for the welfare of the veteran. But I shall also continue to fight for the things the veteran fought for—the preservation of our democratic principles.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I too am a new Member of Congress. The gentleman from Mississippi would like you to believe that the reason the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs

walked out this morning did so because they are walking out on the veterans. I think that is an unfair statement. I believe the first obligation of the Congress is to the veteran. I think every member that walked out this morning walked out only because the chairman was not adhering to the rules of the House, and was acting in a dictatorial fashion.

#### AUTHORIZING READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1949, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit today during general debate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there is important legislation here. Will we be notified when the general debate is over and when the bill is being read for amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see that that is done. The rule calls for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman states that the committee will be notified?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see to it that that is done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

Abbitt	Bloom	Burnside
Allen, Ill.	Bonner	Byrne, N. Y.
Barden	Boykin	Carlyle
Bennett, Fla.	Bulwinkle	Colmer

Coudert	Kennedy	Scott,
Curtis	Linehan	Hugh D., Jr.
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Scudder
deGraffenried	Magee	Shafer
Dingell	Mason	Short
Dolliver	Miles	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Miller, Calif.	Somers
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Staggers
Gavin	Monroney	Stackman
Gorski, Ill.	Morrison, La.	Tackett
Halleck	Morton	Taylor
Heffernan	Nixon	Teague
Herter	O'Toole	Thomas, N. J.
Hinshaw	Pace	Towe
Hoffman, Ill.	Pfeiffer,	Velde
Irving	Joseph L.	Weichel
Jackson, Calif.	Poulson	White, Idaho
Jenison	Powell	Whitten
Jenkins	Reed, Ill.	Willis
Jones, Mo.	Richards	Wilson, Ind.
Judd	Richman	Woodhouse
Kee	Sanborn	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to have until midnight to file a report on the bill H. R. 782.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order on Tuesday, February 15, 1949, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill. The rule waives all points of order and provides for 3 hours of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, the older Members know my position with respect to legislation carried in appropriation bills. However,

I think I owe it to the new Members to explain that it is the duty and the function of the legislative committees to bring in legislative proposals.

The regular rules of the House preclude the Committee on Appropriations from bringing in new legislation, its jurisdiction being confined to making appropriations. Notwithstanding the fact that I have been opposed and am still opposed to the Committee on Appropriations reporting legislation in their general appropriation bills, I feel in this instance that this being a deficiency appropriation bill a waiver of points of order should be had and I favor the passage of the bill for the following reasons. Unfortunately the Republican Eightieth Congress went out of its way through waiver of points of order in restricting certain appropriations which have affected and which might affect the efficiency of some departments of government and which even make it impossible for some of the departments to perform their duties and functions as authorized by the Congress. Consequently I feel we are justified in agreeing to this rule which waives points of order on certain items in the bill.

Before I go any further in discussing provisions of the bill which will later on be explained by the chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure to the satisfaction of the House, I want to say that the Committee on Appropriations has filed and there is available to all Members a report showing the various appropriations provided for, including those that would be subject to points of order. I would advise the new Members to familiarize themselves with this report because, while 3 hours of general debate are provided for, a reading of the report will give them an opportunity to know the contents of the bill. I am satisfied that after careful consideration by the membership they will vote for the rule and later vote for the bill. I think the bill has been carefully prepared. There are reductions from the original amounts asked for by the budget to the extent, I believe, of \$14,000,000. That shows that the Committee on Appropriations has been careful in passing on this legislation before reporting the same to the House. I urge the members to adopt the rule and vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has explained, House Resolution 99 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2632, a bill to make appropriations to supply deficiencies for the fiscal year which ends June 30. The rule also provides for 3 hours of general debate and, in addition, which is very important, waives all points of order on the different sections of the bill.

I wish to say with all the seriousness and conviction at my command that every Member of the House had better

look over this bill carefully. I have served for a great many years on the Rules Committee, and H. R. 2632 is one of the most cleverly drawn measures that I have seen in a very long time. When it was brought before the Rules Committee it was not even in printed form. It had not been reported from the committee, and it had not even been introduced in the House. It was practically impossible to get any information as to what the measure contained. Then some of us on the committee began to ask some questions, and we found that there are many provisions and sections in this bill which are actually of a type that the House should consider, as separate pieces of legislation or each item by itself, and decide for itself, after due consideration, just what policy it desires to follow on such widely different important issues.

For instance, no one can find any fault with some of the sections in this bill, such as those taking care of the needs of the Vice President, or the usual payments to widows of deceased Members. I am sure something has to be done for the Capitol Building and the House and Senate chambers. So that is proper legislation in a measure like this.

The section providing additional fees for jurors in the Federal courts can easily be explained. Also the provision to carry out the intent and purpose of the new law relative to the President's salary, and also for the other matters which have been authorized by the Congress.

Then the bill carries some other provisions. For instance, grants to States for public assistance in connection with administration of unemployment compensation. Incidentally I think it might be well for all Members of the House to check rather carefully to find out just what compensation will be given to each State to carry out the provisions of this law. I can say to you frankly that, regardless of political affiliation, the public officials of the State of Ohio are not at all satisfied with the treatment which that great State has received in this connection.

Then I want to refer, please, to page 7, line 19, the item for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I wonder how many of you can read that section just by a cursory reading, and determine that it is a provision to build, to construct, and to put into operation, the Johnsonville steam plant, which this Congress turned down by direct legislative action, when it refused to put the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Government fairly and squarely into the business of producing electric power. That, and nothing more nor less, is all this steam plant section of the bill amounts to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will give me additional time, I will be glad to yield to him. Yes, if the gentleman will give me 5 minutes extra, I will be more than glad to yield to the gentleman.

When you vote for this rule waiving these points of order, you will make it so they can put into operation this steam plant down in the Tennessee Valley.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This steam plant is to be constructed at an expense of \$2,950,000 of the taxpayers' money, to do something that we have been told all these years the Tennessee Valley Authority never intended to do; that is, to go into direct competition with our privately owned public utilities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I want to go on, if I may. Here in the bill is a provision to continue the life of the War Assets Administration. The House has already passed a bill, just this last week, to extend its life, but we do not know what the Senate or the President may do about it. It might surprise some of you to find that the President may want to do something about liquidating these matters.

I want to go a little further in the discussion of the bill quickly because of time limitation; I want to refer to line 17 on page 16. The entire intent and purpose, force and effect of this particular section is to put Mike Straus and Richard Boke back on the pay roll in California on the Central Valley project. You and I know that a law was passed by the last session of Congress to require that licensed and properly accredited engineers be named for supervisory work of this type because a situation developed out there which was so scandalous, and the waste of the money of the taxpayers of this country has been so great, that, in the opinion of congressional committees which have been investigating, something had to be done.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will yield if the gentleman from Illinois will grant me more time.

If you want to put Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke back on the pay roll and permit this same sort of wasteful activity to go on, then vote for this rule; but if you want to stand by the legislation previously enacted by the Congress, then vote against the rule. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this rule should be voted down. It is time that we bring an end to the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills. Yes, it is time we stop certain committees of this House from legislating by circumvention without permitting the Members of the House to really know what they are voting on. I hope this rule will be voted down. So I ask for a vote of "No" on the adoption of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. Brown, that this membership should have full information on this meas-

ure—indeed, on every measure that is presented to the House. I would not willingly be a party to any procedure depriving the House of information. Appropriation bills are by their nature difficult to draft and difficult to present. Those of us not serving on that great committee must depend upon the report and hearings accompanying each bill and upon the debate. At this moment the provisions of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1949, are not in issue, nor is the continuing controversy of "legislation in appropriation bills" in issue.

The question is, Shall the House follow the recommendation of its Committee on Rules and consider the proposed deficiency appropriation bill without the privilege of attack upon its many items by the use of points of order?

This procedure for the consideration of such a measure is by no means new or unusual. It is not inconsistent with the customs and practice of this body. The position of the gentleman from Ohio in requesting the House to vote against the adoption of the rule is, however, seemingly inconsistent. During the last Congress and for many, many years before, appropriation bills were consistently considered under similar rules.

It is a good rule. It is a necessary rule, for it permits the expeditious consideration of the many and varied problems and issues arising almost daily before the Congress. For example: The bill we seek to consider provides funds for the widows of two of our deceased colleagues. Should it be necessary to refer such an accepted practice to a legislative committee for authorizing legislation? We think not. But without the adoption of this rule a point of order properly raised would likely be sustained. That, to be sure, would not be done. It is an example, however, of the necessity and correctness of this character of procedure.

This rule is democratic. It permits any Member to challenge any part of the bill with which he disagrees by offering an amendment, and it permits the House, by a majority vote, to effect any change its will dictates.

This rule is fair for it makes in order 3 hours of general debate. During that time any Member who desires can surely inquire fully into any or all provisions.

I, too, regret that the Committee on Appropriations has found it necessary at times to write into its bills legislation. I regretted that in the Eightieth Congress. For instance, the matter discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] concerning the Bureau of Reclamation, the hiring of certain personnel, was a provision of an appropriation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. That appropriation bill came to this floor under a similar rule—one waiving points of order. I have that resolution in my hand. It was House Resolution 615, Eightieth Congress. It was recommended by the Committee on Rules of that Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was then a member of that committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The fact of the matter is that provision was not in the bill as it was reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee. It was put in by amendment. If it was out of order when it was offered, a point of order could have been made against it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me, I call his attention to the fact mentioned by the gentleman from New York that the item to which he refers was not in the bill at the time a rule was granted. It was placed in on the floor of the House by an amendment offered by a Democrat from California, by the way, a member of the minority at that time. It was the result of legislation which had been introduced and passed in the Senate. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator DOWNEY, of California. That was not partisan. It was just a very, very good American move.

Mr. LYLE. That is the point I would impress upon you. This procedure is not partisan, nor is it restrictive. Under this rule, any germane amendment may be offered and may be adopted.

It may well be that the House in its wisdom will retain the restrictive clause adopted during the previous Congress. Assuredly, it can do so.

Consideration of the bill under this rule by no means insures its passage in toto. A "yea" vote on the rule does not and is not intended to bind any Member in support of the measure in whole or in part. It permits orderly consideration. It permits the issues to be considered by a majority. It prohibits an individual from successfully urging points of order against individual items and provisions of the bill.

The adoption of this rule is consistent with good legislative procedure and is in accord with the custom and practice of the House. The issues—many of them justly controversial—that will be raised during the consideration of the bill on its merits can be resolved in an orderly and democratic way. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been disturbed about the tendency of the Appropriations Committee to absorb the function of legislating, and I am not criticizing individual members of that committee.

In the bill covered by the pending rule there are something like 10 of those instances. I do not intend upon this occasion to discuss any but 1 of them, which will be found at the bottom of page 16 of the bill and has to do with legislation passed by the last Congress prescribing certain qualifications for the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Assistant Commissioner, and regional directors in the reclamation-project areas.

I think it fair to the House to give the Members, and it must be brief because my time is not long, the background of that legislation. I happen to be familiar with

it because I was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments directed by the full committee to investigate publicity and propaganda activities of the executive departments, a field in which we knew at the time the bureaucracy had been engaged over many, many years at ever-increasing expense until the information reached us that a total of \$75,000,000 was being spent by publicity agencies of the various departments.

In investigating the publicity propaganda efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation we stumbled upon some exceedingly interesting and, I might say, distressing facts. Those facts were submitted in a report by our committee to the Congress, but I doubt if that report, which was made late in the session, was read by a great many Members in the confusion of the closing days.

Going back as briefly as I can to tell the story—and it is not a very nice story—the budget recommended to the Congress in the early winter of 1947 an appropriation of \$30,000,000 to carry on the work in the Central Valley of California project, whose headquarters are at Sacramento. According to the budget estimates there would be an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1947, of something like \$10,000,000. The budget recommended the reappropriation of that \$10,000,000 and an additional \$20,000,000 of new money, making a total of \$30,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations of the House, and later the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, found that the accounts and the reports of the reclamation district out there in the Central Valley project were most unreliable. When inquiries were made as to how much money they would actually have left to spend at the end of the fiscal year it was found, in the first instance, that they reported they would have \$19,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, and then we found in the papers of the Department a report from Sacramento itself to Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, that actually they would have \$25,000,000 left unexpended. Mr. Straus withheld this information from the Congress. And finally, in desperation, either the Senate committee or the House committee appealed to the Bureau of the Budget to actually find out how much money they would have left unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, and the budget reported in round figures \$21,000,000. So, the Congress, acting in accordance with the recommendation of the budget, appropriated the \$21,000,000 unexpended balance, and added \$9,000,000 plus in order to make the total expendable in the next fiscal year \$30,000,000, almost exactly the figure recommended by the President.

Now, what happened? The Bureau of Reclamation was outraged by this. It began agitating in California against the stinginess of the Congress. We found any number of examples of that. But, let me tell you what that regional office out there did. The man at the head of the regional office was a man named Richard L. Boke. He had never had the slightest experience as an engineer, nor had he ever administered any large undertaking. Under him was a man named

Calland, his first assistant. On June 17, 1947, this man Calland sent out a letter to all of the Reclamation officials in the Sacramento Valley region. On June 17 the Congress was just finishing up the appropriation bills, and it was then perfectly apparent that the Central Valley project was going to get \$30,000,000. I will read you a portion of that letter, which was dated June 17, 1947:

Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction on programing and execution, region 2

1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. Because of failure to meet estimated progress, large amounts of appropriated funds have remained unspent at fiscal year ends. This fact has brought severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from others.

2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948 which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending. The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible.

There is an order sent out with the approval of the high command, that, despite the fact that the Congress said they should have \$30,000,000 to cover an entire fiscal year, they must spend it in half a year; and that was done, under the most peculiar circumstances.

As late as September 1947, after the new fiscal year had started, there was a meeting of the reclamation officials at Salt Lake City, about September 1, at which it was generally understood that there was sufficient money left in the appropriations to go at least until February 1, 1948, at which time the Congress would be in session and a deficiency could be asked for, if necessary. Nothing was said about their going broke, until suddenly, on November 26, 1947, a conference met at Sacramento at the regional office, from which it was announced to California and the entire western coast that there was no money left, that all major contracts had to be suspended. Incidentally, Boke, the regional director, did not attend the conference. He had gone off on a vacation 3 or 4 days before.

Mr. Boke upon the stand said, "Yes," he knew about Calland's letter. He had not heard of it, he said, although Calland was his first assistant, until it had been out for 5 or 6 or 7 days. We asked him if he took any measures to counteract that letter which carried the order to this vast organization. He said, "No," he had not. We asked him why he had not done so. For administrative reasons, he said. That is all the explanation we could get.

I asked him if he thought the Calland letter was in conformity with the intent of the Congress, and he admitted it was not.

What happened? The contracts were closed down. One thousand six hundred employees of the contractors were thrown out of work. The contractors filed claims for damages amounting to

\$1,900,000. Were any Federal employees suspended from employment? Not one. They kept them all on, although most of the work in the field had stopped.

Senator WHERRY heard of this thing a day or two before it happened. He was completely surprised. The members of our Committee on Appropriations did not hear of it until afterward. They were completely surprised.

The instant that close-down took effect they flooded the California newspapers with violent attacks against the Congress for not having appropriated enough money. Now, that is the fact. There is your propaganda, deliberate, although they had violated all decent rules of financial management in spending in 6 months the amount of money which the Congress said should last them for 12 months. That is the fact.

The committee employed one of the best-known chartered public accountants in San Francisco to look into the books of that office at Sacramento, the regional office.

After a lengthy investigation and auditing he found that instead of their being broke on November 26 there were \$7,000,000 still left unspent. That is the kind of administration we had. It did not stop there. I have referred to the meeting at Salt Lake City attended by reclamation officers from the Western States. It was attended by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus, as well as all the regional directors and engineers. In the appropriation bill which was passed applicable to the year commencing July 1, 1948, the Congress had seen fit to reduce the appropriations for their information and publicity services from \$150,000 to \$50,000. Of course, that was with the intent and in the expectation that the personnel employed in this publicity propaganda business—and we saw a great deal of the publications and many of them were not at all sensible—would be dropped from the pay roll. Did that happen? Not one of them was dropped from the pay roll. In the meeting at Salt Lake City Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, described how they had avoided dropping anybody from the pay roll. He said he changed the name plates of the persons: he transferred them to jobs with different names and left them on the pay roll.

You may be interested to know what the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service said about that. The chief engineer, Mr. Young, made a speech before that gathering, and we obtained transcripts of all the speeches, in which he said—I quote:

There was a legal procedure involved there and we even went so far as to perjure ourselves to get ourselves out of the woods. It didn't amount to anything in money, but the principle is there.

There you have it—he admitted perjury.

Now that is the atmosphere in which this thing has been run by Straus and Boke. I am telling you the truth about it. Another little incident occurred out there which may be of interest. It may not be important, but the Secretary of the Interior was present at that Salt



Lake City meeting and made an address. He was denouncing the Congress, as they all did. This merely indicates the contempt in which certain elements of the bureaucracy hold the Congress. He was denouncing the Congress and he said apropos of his connections and contacts with the Congress:

When you try to explain these matters to some "jass-ack" from across the river who has never had anything to do with such a construction program in his life, why you really got to have an excuse, and then I doubt it will do any good.

"Jass-acks," I greet you!

Well, I asked him in the hearings:

What river did you have in mind, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary KRUG. I do not recall, but I meant the general problem of explaining carry-overs to anyone. \* \* \*

Mr. WADSWORTH. To what river did you refer?

Secretary KRUG. Perhaps the Mississippi—I do not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am disappointed. I thought perhaps you were going to say the Hudson.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts which were brought out, and many others which I have not related to you—many others—the Congress last year provided, in an amendment to an appropriation bill, to be sure, as a restriction on the expenditure of funds, that hereafter public funds shall not be expended for the salaries of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation or a regional director, unless that officer has had 5 years' experience as an engineer and administrator. That provision took effect on January 1 of this year. I suppose Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke are out of office. Here we have in an appropriation bill a provision to put them back. The Committee on Public Lands has had no chance whatsoever to look into this thing, and as I understand it, it falls rightly within the jurisdiction of that committee. I do not think it is the part of the Committee on Appropriations to bring in an item like this asking a waiver of all points of order, in order that those two men, whose incompetence was demonstrated over and over again, may be reappointed. I am not violating any confidence. It is a matter of public knowledge that a sterling Democrat on our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wilson] wrote his own report about those people and was just as severe as the report written by the other members on the Republican side. There was no party division on that subcommittee. I am hoping that in view of this situation the Public Lands Committee will be given a chance to look into these things, which they will not have if this rule is adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a member of the Public Lands Committee, I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman for making this information available to me and other members of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is all in our committee report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This information has not been before our committee heretofore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members who were here in the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in power, remember that that restriction was placed in the appropriation bill then under consideration, stopping the payment to those two men, and also a restriction on expenditures in reclamation. It was passed when only a few Members were on the floor of the House.

This matter had been considered by three committees of the Congress and by the Senate Appropriations and the House Appropriations Committee, and both committees found no reason to take any action against either Commissioner Straus or Mr. Boke. Both committees, by nearly unanimous action, recommended that appropriations be provided for both these gentlemen because the committees undoubtedly realized that while the Reclamation Division employed hundreds of engineers, it was also quite necessary that the Division be staffed with men possessing administrative and executive ability, which both these gentlemen have demonstrated in long years of Government service. These men sought to protect the public interest, and the fight against them were by those who were more interested in the private power interests.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield now.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has quoted some speeches. We all sometimes make speeches here and there, and sometimes use words that may not be proper or that would not appeal to everyone. Now, the gentleman has paid a great deal of attention to it, and I hope that he is not being misled, as other people have been misled in California, due to the publicity that was given to this matter by the private power corporations that were opposed to the rulings of Straus and the Department of Reclamation, because they were trying to safeguard and protect the efforts on the part of the Government to construct, build, and complete projects in the interest of the public and not in the interest of a few private power interested corporations.

I am informed that a great deal of advertising space in California newspapers was used and paid for by the private corporations opposed to the ruling of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation refusing to yield on the 160-acre limit that Congress established, and because they failed to grant the things the private interests were seeking which would have been against the best interests of the Government and the people in that section of the country.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. Can the gentleman say whether the Rules Committee was

given any information about the very large sums of money expended by the private power companies through the newspapers and advertising agencies in the Central Valley area to persuade the people of California that the Government's program for public control of the power development on the Central Valley project was an evil thing? Does he know that millions of dollars were expended by the private power companies of California through newspapers and other agencies of propaganda to conduct this enormous advertising campaign? And that the power companies charged up to operating expenses the cost of these newspaper advertisements and the other propaganda, and that those operating expenses in turn were charged up to the ratepayers of these private corporations, who are taxpayers of California? Has that information been brought before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SABATH. No; it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules; but I have received such information from certain sources that have been opposed to the activities of these large private power corporations which are trying in every conceivable way to obtain benefits to the disadvantage of the Government and the taxpayers.

Now, may I say to my Republican friends that an outstanding Republican Member in the last Congress, Mr. Robert Jones, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee, insisted on the floor that the money should be expended, that these improvements should be proceeded with in haste, and that if he had the power he would demand, and urge, bringing about still greater speed in the execution of these projects that were criticized by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot yield. I have the floor and shall delete anything the gentleman may have said which the reporter may have taken down in his interruption during the course of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, personally, I am satisfied that the Committee on Appropriations that has heard the evidence used good judgment in embodying in the bill before us the various provisions contained therein striking out restrictions put in by the Republican Congress so as to hamstring the various departments in every conceivable way in the performance of their duty in the interest of the country. It was generally recognized then, and it is known now, the American people have spoken and disagreed with the policy of the celebrated Eightieth Congress.

In view of the existing situation I feel that the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 121, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—242

Abernethy	Gore	Noland
Addonizio	Gorski, N. Y.	Norblad
Albert	Gossett	Norrell
Allen, La.	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Angell	Grant	O'Hara, Ill.
Aspinall	Green	O'Konski
Bailey	Gregory	O'Neill
Baring	Gross	O'Sullivan
Barrett, Pa.	Hagen	Pace
Barrett, Wyo.	Hardy	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Patman
Battle	Harris	Patman
Beckworth	Harrison	Perkins
Bentsen	Hart	Peterson
Blumiller	Havener	Philbin
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	Phillips, Tenn.
Bloom	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Polk
Bolling	Hedrick	Powell
Bolton, Md.	Herlong	Preston
Brooks	Hobbs	Price
Brown, Ga.	Hollifield	Priest
Bryson	Holmes	Quinn
Buchanan	Horan	Rabaut
Buckley, Ill.	Howell	Rains
Buckley, N. Y.	Huber	Ramsay
Burdick	Hull	Rankin
Burke	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Burleson	Jacobs	Rhodes
Burton	Jennings	Ribicoff
Camp	Johnson	Rivers
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Carnahan	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Carroll	Karst	Rooney
Cavalcante	Karsten	Sabath
Celler	Kee	Sadowski
Chatham	Kelley	Sasser
Chelf	Keogh	Sheppard
Chesney	Kerr	Sikes
Christopher	Kilday	Sims
Chudoff	King	Smathers
Clemente	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Combs	Klein	Spence
Cooley	Kruse	Staggers
Cooper	Lane	Stanley
Cox	Lanham	Steed
Crook	Larcade	Stigler
Crosser	Lemke	Stockman
Davenport	Lesinski	Sullivan
Davies, N. Y.	Lind	Sutton
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Tauriello
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Teague
Deane	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Deaney	McCarthy	Thompson
Denton	McCormack	Thornberry
Dollinger	McDonough	Tollefson
Donohue	McGrath	Trimble
Doughton	McGuire	Underwood
Douglas	McKinnon	Wagner
Doyle	McSweeney	Walsh
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Welch, Mo.
Eberhart	Mack, Wash.	Wheeler
Elliott	Madden	Whitaker
Engle, Calif.	Magee	White, Calif.
Evins	Mahon	White, Idaho
Fallon	Mansfield	Whitten
Feighan	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fernandez	Marsalis	Wickersham
Fisher	Marshall	Wier
Flood	Morrow	Williams
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Forand	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Okla.
Frazier	Mills	Winstead
Fugate	Morgan	Withrow
Furcolo	Morris	Wood
Garmatz	Moulder	Worley
Gary	Multer	Yates
Gathings	Murdock	Young
Gilmer	Murphy	Zablocki
Gordon	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—121

Allen, Calif.	Bramblett	Cunningham
Andersen	Brehm	Dague
H. Carl	Brown, Ohio	Davis, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Andresen	Canfield	Dondero
August H.	Case, N. J.	Eaton
Arends	Case, S. Dak.	Elston
Auchincloss	Chapierfield	Engel, Mich.
Bates, Mass.	Church	Fenton
Beall	Clevenger	Ford
Bennett, Mich.	Cole, Kans.	Fulton
Bishop	Cole, N. Y.	Gamble
Blackney	Corbett	Gillette
Boggs, Del.	Cotton	Golden
Bolton, Ohio	Crawford	Goodwin

Graham	Lichtenwalter	Sadlak
Hale	Lodge	St. George
Hall	Lovre	Scott, Hardie
Edwin Arthur	McCulloch	Scott,
Hand	McGregor	Hugh D., Jr.
Harden	McMillen, Ill.	Scrivner
Harvey	Macy	Scudder
Herter	Martin, Iowa	Secrest
Heselton	Martin, Mass.	Short
Hill	Meyer	Simpson, Ill.
Hinshaw	Michener	Simpson, Pa.
Hoeven	Miller, Md.	Smith, Kans.
Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Nelson	Stefan
James	Nicholson	Taber
Jensen	O'Hara, Minn.	Talle
Jonas	Patterson	Van Zandt
Kean	Pfeiffer	Vorys
Kearney	William L.	Vursell
Kearns	Phillips, Calif.	Wadsworth
Keating	Pickett	Walter
Keefe	Plumley	Werdel
Kilburn	Potter	Wigglesworth
Kunkel	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Latham	Rees	Wolcott
LeCompte	Rich	Wolverton
LeFevre	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—70

Abbitt	Gorski, Ill.	Nixon
Allen, Ill.	Gwinn	Norton
Barden	Hall	O'Toole
Bennett, Fla.	Leonard W.	Pfeifer
Bland	Halleck	Joseph L.
Bonner	Heffernan	Poulson
Bosone	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Irving	Regan
Breen	Jackson, Calif.	Richards
Bulwinkle	Javits	Riehlman
Burnside	Jenison	Sanborn
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins	Shafer
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Ohio
Coffey	Judd	Somers
Colmer	Kennedy	Tackett
Coudert	Linehan	Taylor
Curtis	McConnell	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	McMillan, S. C.	Towe
DeGraffenried	Mason	Velde
Dingell	Miles	Vinson
Dolliver	Mitchell	Welch
Ellsworth	Monroney	Welch, Calif.
Fellows	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Gavin	Morton	Woodhouse

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Halleck against.  
Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Towe against.  
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Riehlman against.  
Mr. Monroney for, with Mr. Coudert against.  
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.  
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Jenkins against.  
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.  
Mr. Gorski of Illinois for, with Mr. Gavin against.  
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.  
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Taylor against.  
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Weichel against.  
Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. McConnell against.  
Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Shafer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Allen of Illinois.  
Mr. Richards with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.  
Mr. Somers with Mr. Sanborn.  
Mr. Burnside with Mr. Dolliver.  
Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Fellows.  
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Jackson of California.  
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Judd.  
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Mason.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Nixon.  
Mr. Barden with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Regan with Mr. Jenison.  
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Poulson.  
Mr. Irving with Mr. Velde.

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ANGELL and Mr. HARRIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report accompanying the bill, H. R. 2632, does not comply with the so-called Ramseyer rule.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that although the resolution which has been adopted waives points of order against the bill by the provisions contained therein it does not specifically waive or exempt the so-called Ramseyer rule which requires that a report accompanying a bill, including appropriation bills, shall set forth in appropriate type the text of the statute it is proposed to repeal.

In this connection I invite the Chair's attention to the fact that on page 8 of the proposed bill, line 6, it is proposed to repeal a title in a previous act of Congress, and again on page 16, lines 15 and 16, the bill carries this language: "and the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under said head are hereby repealed."

I have diligently searched the entire report on the bill and can find no citation of the statute to be repealed in order to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

I make the point of order which, if sustained, as I understand it, would automatically recommit the bill to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule:

Notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order—

And so forth—

and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair indulge me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will indulge the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the rule in the House Manual, a citation is made to a precedent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-first Congress, second session, page 10595. This citation reads:

Special orders providing for consideration of bills, unless making specific exemption, do not preclude the point of order that reports on such bills fail to indicate proposed changes in existing law. (Cannon's, sec. 9220a; 71st Cong., 2d sess., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10595.)

I fail to see any provision in the rule adopted which specifically exempts clause 2a of rule XIII, the Ramseyer rule.



The SPEAKER. The Ramseyer rule is a rule of the House, and this resolution states "all rules to the contrary notwithstanding," it shall be in order to consider the bill.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks at this time will be limited to a brief summary of the bill and the action of the Committee on Appropriations now presented for consideration by this body.

The report before you contains a rather detailed explanation of each item contained in the bill which is, as you are aware, the first appropriation bill reported to the Eighty-first Congress. First of all I wish to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee, all of whom have been very cooperative and pleasant to work with. We are, of course, honored by having the chairman of the full committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Appropriations.

The bill before you contains a total in recommended appropriations of \$466,800,000, which represents a reduction of \$14,000,000 in the budget estimates. I want to point out, however, that of the total request of \$480,800,000 approximately \$353,000,000 was requested for items over which neither the administration nor the committee had much control. For example, \$151,000,000 is for additional grants-in-aid for public assistance made necessary by the enactment of legislation since the original fiscal year 1949 budget was presented. Almost \$103,000,000 is for the postal service, part of which is due to the increased volume of mail and part of which is due to increased transportation rates imposed on the Post Office by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An amount of nearly \$100,000,000 is included for the veterans' benefits. The net result is that there remained only an amount of something over \$127,000,000 in which the committee could effect some reductions, and out of this total the amount of \$14,000,000 has been saved.

I wish to call your attention to one item, a recommended appropriation of \$2,274,500 for reconstruction of the roof in the House Chamber and for other needed improvements. The Senate made a similar appropriation last year, and it was the thought of the Architect of the Capitol and the committee that considerable savings in the ultimate cost could be effected if the work on both roofs was done simultaneously.

As you read through the report you will notice that many of the deficiency items included in the bill are the result of legislation enacted subsequent to the presentation of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates. This is the case in connection with the Office of Defense Transportation whose existence was continued until June 30, 1949, by the enactment of Public Law 606, Eightieth Congress.

The Displaced Persons Commission received an initial appropriation of \$2,000,000 with a proviso that it could be obligated and expended during the first three-quarters of the fiscal year; hence, the need for this deficiency.

I previously mentioned the grants to States for public assistance. This calls for an amount of \$151,000,000 made necessary by the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of Public Law 642, increasing the Federal share of the contributions for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children.

With respect to grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service, the committee is recommending the full amount of the estimate, or \$4,987,000. However, the committee, because of the great divergence of opinion on this item, has instituted a study of the situation by its own investigative staff and will later entertain recommendations for such adjustments as the facts may justify.

For the Federal Housing Administration the committee increased the limitation under administrative expenses from \$19,000,000 to \$23,000,000 because of the tremendous increase in applications for loans. These administrative expenses, as you are aware, come out of the corporate earnings of the Administration and not out of the general fund of the Treasury.

The Housing Expediter requested \$7,450,000. The subcommittee recommends \$4,800,000, which will carry the activity through the month of May, prior to which time, undoubtedly, some new legislation affecting this agency will be passed by the Congress.

The bill includes \$2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which \$2,500,000 is for beginning construction on the New Johnsonville steam plant. Although this item was left out of the regular 1949 appropriation act after considerable discussion of the matter in committee and on the floor, it is the thought of the committee that, so long as this is a Federal project, it should be made as efficient an operation as possible.

The bill includes nearly \$100,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. This amount is largely attributable to amendments to the authorizing act passed by the Eightieth Congress subsequent to the consideration of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates.

For the War Assets Administration the bill includes the amount of \$12,500,000. Under present law this agency is to go out of existence on February 28. However, in view of the President's recommendation for legislation to establish one over-all disposal agency, it is thought that the War Assets Administration should be continued in existence until the end of this year in order that a more

orderly transition may be effected when the new agency is established. The bill (H. R. 2402), extending the life of the War Assets Administration to June 30, was, as you are aware, passed by the House yesterday.

Two items are included for the Department of Agriculture. They are not large from the standpoint of money but are nonetheless important. The first is an amount of something over \$9,700,000 for establishing acreage allotments for cotton and wheat as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The other item is an increase of something over \$3,000,000 in the administrative-expense limitation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The record crops and the recent drop in prices have trebled the number of loans from that contemplated originally.

There are five items in the Department of Commerce, the most important of which is an amount of \$11,000,000, for the census of business authorized by the Eightieth Congress. The census will cover all the retail establishments in the Nation as of December 31, 1948, estimated to number 3,000,000.

Under the Department of the Interior there is an item of \$6,000,000 for the Bonneville Power Administration, the amount to be used for extending electrical transmission facilities. Two small items are included for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; one in the amount of \$360,000 for the Navajo and Hopi service, mostly for salary increases under Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress, and \$385,000 for the welfare of Indians, generally. A number of construction items are included under the Bureau of Reclamation, both from the Reclamation fund and from the general fund. Under the Reclamation fund the bill includes \$975,000 for continuing construction on three projects—two in Idaho and one in Utah. Three items are included for construction under the general fund. These also are continuing projects, and the added amounts are made necessary in the main because of contract earnings beyond the availability of appropriations. The total of these three projects is \$10,800,000. Also included is an amount of \$4,500,000 for the Missouri River Basin project. As most of you gentlemen are aware, this is a development covering 10 States of the Missouri River Basin and includes irrigation, power, navigation, flood control, and water for municipal and other purposes.

A number of items are included for the Corps of Engineers, National Military Establishment. For rivers and harbors a recommended amount of \$10,500,000 is to provide for continuing construction on the McNary lock and dam and for beginning construction on the Ice Harbor lock and dam and the Chief Joseph lock and dam, the last two of which are interrelated to the power development in the Northwest area. Under flood control, general, the bill includes \$14,000,000 for continuing construction on six projects. The bill also includes \$2,500,000 for the emergency fund needed to complete the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees in the Columbia Basin damaged by floods in May and June 1948.

Almost \$103,000,000 is included for the postal service, of which \$70,000,000 is for railroad transportation; \$17,000,000 for foreign air-mail service, and \$13,000,000 for the postal vehicle service. The additional appropriation is made necessary by a temporary increase of 25 percent in rail rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and because of a tremendous increase in mail volume. Increased rates were also approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for foreign air mail.

Three items are included for the Treasury Department. In the case of two of these, no action could be taken by the committee. One is the amount of \$2,300,000 for the payment of claims and another is \$800,000 for refund of moneys erroneously received and covered into the Treasury. The committee allowed \$1,500,000 for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of an additional 16,000,000 sheets of currency for replacement, principally in the one-dollar-bill category.

As I indicated previously, while the total of appropriations in the bill is substantial, many of the items could not be reduced. I feel that the committee has done a good job and has reduced wherever reductions could be made without jeopardizing the authorized programs of the various departments. I hope that the House will sustain the recommendations of the committee in full.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make no motions with reference to most of the amounts contained in this bill. One exception is the amount for the steam plant at the TVA at Johnsonville, Tenn. I intend to discuss that in a moment.

I will first call attention to two or three of the major items of legislation involved in the bill, to which I am opposed.

At the bottom of page 13 there is an item under "Bonneville Power Administration," and following that on page 14 is an item which repeals the limitation under the head of "Bonneville Power Administration" on the use of funds for force account activities. There is also a limitation on the amount of money that may be spent for propaganda. I am opposed to the repeal of both of those items. They were put in for the protection of the Government.

The force account limitation was put in so that they would have to comply with the rules, and let the jobs to contract and get them done in a reasonable way for a reasonable sum, rather than to fill up the pay roll of the department with a lot of people who were unnecessary, and allow the work to drag and allow the people to work about half time, as they had been doing for a long time.

The idea of repealing the limitation on propaganda activities, allowing them to spend all the funds that are appropriated and made available to the agency for propaganda, has no appeal to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice that the committee has given the amount for the Veterans' Administration asked for by the budget. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration ask for any more than the budget allowed?

Mr. TABER. They did not. The item with reference to the Veterans' Administration appears on page 8. There is an item for national service life insurance, \$55,000,000. They stated that they thought that would carry them through to the end of the year without any trouble.

The next item is \$190,000 for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, which is a very small item and a very small activity.

The next item is \$44,189,000. That is for veterans' miscellaneous benefits. They told us that they thought that would carry them through all right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration give any information as to when the accumulated dividends would be paid to the veterans?

Mr. TABER. They did not in these hearings; no. I did not expect, the way they were operating on that, that such a result would come about for 2 or 3 months, in all probability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought if perhaps more persons were put on the work the men might receive the dividends sooner.

Mr. TABER. It would be better if they could.

Mr. RABAUT. I should think that would be a matter to be referred to the regular subcommittee having veterans' affairs in charge.

Mr. TABER. That would be an item that would be considered when the regular annual bill came up. We took up nothing in this bill but deficiency estimates; and some of those deficiency estimates were considered in regular committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There would be an appropriation, because they have the authority for it already.

Mr. TABER. If it were necessary to make an appropriation in order to meet what expenditures were required there would be no delay that I know of in anything of that kind by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman give us some idea of what this \$44,000,000 item for miscellaneous expenses consists of in general?

Mr. TABER. It is such things as burial allowances and matters of a special character rather than the regular large items of pensions or education aid and that sort of thing; those are not included in it.

Mr. KEATING. It is to cover special-items?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman from New York will yield, there

is a full description of that item on page 7 of the committee report.

Mr. TABER. The next item I expect to take up is on page 15 where there is another force account item under the Bureau of Reclamation. What I said about the force account in the Bonneville item applies equally to this item.

We pass now to page 16 where there is a section repealing the first four or five provisions under the appropriation act for the Interior Department 1949 and repeals the limitation which would throw them out. One of those limitations provides that not to exceed about \$7,500,000 shall be transferred out of construction funds to the different administrative funds in the Bureau of Reclamation; in other words, they can spend the whole of the construction funds on salaries and expenses in their offices and agencies rather than have any limitation or any control such as the Congress set up for them.

Another of the provisions repeals the prohibition against spending more than \$50,000 for propaganda purposes. It has no merit whatever.

The next item is at line 17 on page 16 where the Mike Straus amendment appears, to put Mike Straus back. He was so incompetent that they want to keep him; and I shall have to admit that that is the chief qualification for a New Deal appointment. But that does not appeal to me, nor does it promote efficiency in government.

These are the major items in the bill with reference to which there will be controversy. I would not say that they were all of them but they are the major ones.

I wish now to discuss for a little while the item relating to the steam plant in the TVA.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On page 4, under "Appropriations for the judiciary," I have been consulted in my district by the secretary to the district judge regarding the purchase of typewriters. Can the gentleman inform me what the present provision in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act is regarding the typewriter question, or can someone on the gentleman's committee give us that information?

Mr. TABER. There is a limitation, as I understand it, that typewriters may not be purchased at a price above 90 percent of the lowest price quoted a commercial purchaser. I think that is correct?

Mr. KEATING. But under this provision it is intended, as I read it, to permit the purchase now by those who need them in the judicial branch of the United States new typewriters, and not simply have to recondition the old typewriters?

Mr. TABER. They would be confined to the price set forth in the Treasury-Post Office bill. There would be no limitation on their funds for the purchase of typewriters if they could be bought within the limitation which has been prescribed, provided they have the funds appropriated to them for that purpose, and I understand they have.



Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the TVA item on page 7, line 20, I propose to offer an amendment which will reduce the item of \$2,950,000 to \$450,000. They have asked for \$450,000 for a couple of generators, for the initial payments on them anyway, in one of the hydroelectric set-ups, and that I am not going to oppose; but the two and a half million dollars is to start the steam plant, and that I am going to oppose. I will have to offer a similar amendment cutting two and a half million dollars out of the \$24,000,000 item in line 24, and I will move also to strike out the part of the limitation which they propose to repeal beginning with the word "and" in line 4, page 8, and going through the rest of the paragraph.

I will also offer an amendment which would prohibit the use of funds for the construction of a steam power plant. What are the facts with reference to that steam power plant?

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Tennessee Valley Authority marketed 12,244,000 kilowatts of power. That appears on page 11 of the financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority which I have before me. The TVA has had appropriated to it funds which will increase its available power plants, including the steam plants and the ones they already have. They have steam plants at the present time capable of producing 448,000 kilowatts an hour. They have hydro plants capable of producing 2,200,000 kilowatts an hour, or a total of 2,650,000 kilowatts. That means that they have available approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell in the course of a year. Of course, they cannot sell all of it because of peaks; that is, they have peak loads during the day. They probably have power available at the present time amounting to about 4,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell if they could sell at all. They tell us that they will have available power projects that are coming in with the funds that are already appropriated, and with the generators that are here provided, amounting to 3,504,000 kilowatts of power-generating capacity. That will produce for sale approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Now, that is 50 percent above what they sold in the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my understanding that private power companies use about two-thirds of their capacity, while the TVA has only used about one-half of its capacity; that is, if they use their two-thirds capacity like private power companies do, there would be no necessity for this steam plant.

Mr. TABER. There is no necessity for it anyway, because they have got the power capacity to take care of their loads with a margin now. Their steam capacity is plenty to firm up the hydro power that they have or ever will have, because they can run their hydro power or they can run their steam power in the low periods and hold back their water if they

have a dry season, and ultimately use their steam or their hydro power effectively.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any testimony produced before the gentleman's committee to show that some of the cities in Tennessee, I will not say had been compelled, but did make contracts with the TVA that they would not build any electric power plants within their cities?

Mr. TABER. There was not before our committee this time, but there has been such testimony before the Committee on Appropriations heretofore. Those contracts are in existence. Those municipalities and cooperatives all would have the right, if the TVA would let them, and the TVA could let them without any trouble, to build all the power plants that they wanted. They should do that if we are going to have the expensive method of providing peak power gone into in the TVA.

Let me give you the general picture of the TVA, because I think people generally ought to understand it. The low rates down in the TVA and for Federal power generally are caused by this fact: The TVA sets up only \$2,000,000 for taxes. It has estimated power earnings, according to page 11 of its financial statement, of \$48,000,000 a year. This means 4 percent. The private power concerns run 20 to 22 or 23 percent in their over-all tax, and that extra tax is part of the place where they save the money to the power users in their localities.

I checked the record in the manuals in the library, and I know one private power concern right next to this set-up where they have a gross revenue of \$125,000,000 and paid taxes of \$23,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total capitalization of the TVA?

Mr. TABER. The total capitalization of the TVA that is allocated to power is \$48,000,000, and they never have paid a cent of interest on that power set-up to the Treasury of the United States. They never paid any money back until this last year, when they paid just a hair under \$31,000,000.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out to the Members of the House that there is authorization in the TVA Act for turning into the Treasury each year some \$20,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is so, toward principal, but there is no authorization for the payment of any interest. The taxpayers in the rest of the country are subsidizing the rates in the TVA by the TVA's avoiding the payment of taxes and by the failure to charge enough rates to cover a proper depreciation charge, which should be at least \$11,500,000, and interest at the rate of 3 percent, which is what would be fair for the TVA to pay back.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out if there is a public power plank in the Republican platform?

Mr. TABER. Maybe there is, but that did not mean a dishonest public power

outfit that did not pay its way. It meant having things in such shape that the people of the United States who were not in the power district would not have to pay the electric-light bills and power bills of the folks in that district.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the statement the gentleman makes that you are paying the light bills of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. That is not true.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it. The statistics all bear it out.

Mr. EVINS. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is not in favor of that project?

Mr. TABER. Not the seaway; no.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The gentleman ought to be heard on this important point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Pfeiffer
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Joseph L.
Arends	Gorski, Ill.	Philbin
Baring	Green	Poulson
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Ramsay
Blackney	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Bland	Hébert	Richards
Bonner	Heffernan	Richman
Boykin	Herter	Rivers
Brooks	Heselton	Sanborn
Bryson	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Buckley, Ill.	Irving	Schriener
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Burnside	Jenison	Short
Carlyle	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Clemente	Judd	Somers
Coffey	Kennedy	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Tackett
Coudert	Kilday	Taylor
Cox	Lind	Thomas, N. J.
Crosser	Linehan	Towe
Curtis	McCulloch	Van Zandt
DeGraffenried	McSweeney	Velde
Dingell	Mason	Vinson
Doyle	Miles	Welch
Durham	Monroney	Welch, Calif.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Morton	Withrow
Feighan	Moulder	Woodhouse
Fellows	Nixon	Woodruff
Fernandez	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I stated a little while ago that I believe that according to the evidence the TVA submitted themselves in their own reports, and on pages 40, 41, and 42 of the hearings, they have demonstrated that this item is not necessary for the benefit of

the people in that locality, because they have already in sight a 50-percent margin of power over what they are presently using.

Perhaps it might be interesting to the House if the House were told that some of the smartest corporations of the country have moved into that locality to take advantage of these low, subsidized power rates.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Would the gentleman tell the committee the names of the corporations that have gone down South in order to take advantage of this cheap rate that has been subsidized at the expense of the taxpayers, say all those of New England, and in Connecticut especially? Also, will this not in effect invite new industries that might be starting in New England and some older industries to go down South to Tennessee, at the expense of the taxpayers in the North, to start operations?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct. Some of the corporations that have been smart enough to go in there are the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., the Vickers Chemical Co., and the Pennsylvania Salt Co. There are a great many more of those smart corporations. I do not blame them for going in there and taking advantage of this opportunity, but the taxpayers of the gentleman's territory and those in my territory are carrying that load.

I think it is about time that there be a complete review of this public-power business and that the whole thing be on the basis of fairness, with the power project carrying its share of the load and its share of the taxes. I do not think we should get into this situation and not have these power projects carry their part of the load. I cannot support it, and I feel that I shall have to do everything I can to bring it to the attention of the House and to see that the House has a full opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I respect the position the gentleman has held on the Committee on Appropriations as a former chairman, but I wish that he would be fair and tell all the facts.

Mr. TABER. I have told all the facts, except this: They charge \$9,000,000 depreciation as against \$11,500,000, according to the rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They pay no interest. Those are the things I have not told.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman just stated on the floor that these industries had moved into that area. That is not the truth. These industries have been in this area for some time. The testimony did not show that a single industry had ever moved from the North or the East or the South.

Mr. TABER. It did so.

Mr. EVINS. It did say some branch plants had grown up, and there had been some natural growth, but not a single one had moved from the North.

Mr. TABER. Many have moved into that area.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman knows that is not true.

Mr. TABER. I know it is true, and the gentleman knows it is true. Let us be honest about it. Let us have the TVA pay to the Treasury of the United States \$15,000,000 interest on the \$480,000,000 investment. That is our peak interest and that is what it will cost the people of the United States and the taxpayers.

Let us have them charge their depreciation and pay it back every year. Let us have this public-power business put on an honest basis, dollar for dollar, and let the people of the United States understand that it is going to be honest and that it is going to be kept honest.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this being general debate, I want to make certain remarks before referring specifically to the terms of the bill. I want to say a brief word in regard to the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

#### APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

I have been a member of the committee for many years. I have long considered it the most important committee in the House of Representatives. Because of present conditions in the world both at home and abroad I consider it has a tremendous responsibility.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, it has been the opinion of Members on both sides of the aisle belonging to this great committee that that committee could only do its work properly, in a manner worthy of the confidence of the House and of the country, if by some means or other it could obtain a competent, expert, permanent staff, a staff equipped to make investigations and analyses when the occasion demands.

As I stand here and look back over the years, I can hear Member after Member standing in the well of this House, Members from both sides of the aisle, making an appeal for that kind of staff.

We finally got the necessary authority for that staff, Mr. Chairman. It came in the so-called reorganization bill approved August 2, 1946.

That bill provides that—

Each standing committee of the House and Senate, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is authorized to appoint by majority vote not more than four professional staff members . . . on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

That bill goes further, Mr. Chairman. It provides that—

The Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate is authorized to appoint such staff as each committee by majority vote shall determine to be necessary . . . and to conduct such studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency as it may deem meet.

In other words, each Appropriations Committee was authorized to have an unlimited staff, subject only to the judgment of the committee, and essential appropriations.

In my judgment this was one of the most important and most helpful features of the entire Reorganization Act.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? Not long after the Reorganization Act a beginning was made on a real staff for this great committee. Some 8 or 10 permanent employees were appointed, with contemplated expansion. The regular staff was augmented by a group of consultants from private enterprise, who gave generously of their time in the interest of economy. A small allowance for expenses was permitted, and the time and transportation of these individuals was a donation to the cause of good government.

In this manner, skills far beyond the ability of the Government to provide were made available to the committee.

Numbered among these men were 10 of the country's outstanding accountants, picked as a special committee by the American Institute of Accountants. All of these men were, of course, certified public accountants of national standing, and one is currently president of the New York State Certified Public Accountants Society.

The remaining men were business executives and research assistants of considerable standing, many of whom were, and are continuing to be, used as consultants by various Government agencies which have learned to value their counsel and assistance.

There was no partisanship in the activity, as the group was very representative of both political parties, although all were united on behalf of Government economy.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the staff, the major studies completed were as follows:

First. An exhaustive study of the then Federal Public Housing Administration, extending into nine States. The study exposed many vicious illegal practices, and was the basis of corrective legislation. As a result, the agency undertook a real reorganization, eliminating frills, waste, and extravagance.

Second. A review of the Department of Agriculture budget for 1948, including all the bureaus and agencies of that Department, resulting in many recommendations of benefit to the Department. This review also encompassed a particular inquiry into the Rural Electrification Administration.

Third. A study of the Maritime Commission for both 1948 and 1949, which resulted in corrective legislation recovering for the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fourth. Studies of the Veterans' Administration's requirements for both 1948 and 1949, which information has been the basis of a great deal of organizational correction. This study likewise went into the Federal hospital picture in great detail and has formed the basis of continued study by the Hoover Commission as well as the Veterans' Administration themselves.



Fifth. A study of the War Assets Administration for 1948.

Sixth. Continuing studies of the Department of the Interior for 1948 and 1949, including such technical subjects as an analysis of existing Federal power policy and including spot checks of the accounting systems in the various field installations, which were made available to the Department of the Interior and are currently the basis of accounting reorganizations.

Seventh. Detailed analyses of the operations of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Compensation, which materially assisted in the reorganization of those agencies and will no doubt be very helpful in the 1950 hearings. This particular investigation required a great deal of field study and resulted in the exposure of especially flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in the State of Tennessee. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Justice and to the United States Civil Service Commission, who are currently investigating the matter, with a view to dealing with the offenders.

Eighth. A detailed analysis of the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which resulted in the location of widespread abuses and inefficiency. The report has been made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, and studies are now being made and many improvements instituted that were recommended in this report. As a corollary to this investigation, particularly flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in Massachusetts were uncovered. This information was likewise turned over to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice for their investigation.

The Civil Service Commission has cited for removal some twenty-odd employees in one Massachusetts office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I understand the Department of Justice still has the matter under consideration.

Ninth. An exhaustive investigation of the Department of State, which likewise located many flagrant abuses of good administration, and also located a list of undesirable individuals with subversive connections who were then employed by the State Department. Subsequent to the exposure, some 30 to 40 of these individuals were separated from the service. It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals mentioned in the original list were later questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Tenth. A study of the Treasury Department budget for 1948 and 1949.

Eleventh. A study of the Army and Air Force budgets for 1948 and 1949, which formed a basis of rescissions approximating \$5,000,000,000 returned to the taxpayers by this committee.

Twelfth. A study of the budget of the Navy for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, which likewise formed a basis for substantial monetary rescissions and appropriations reductions.

Thirteenth. An executive study on operations of the Government in the Territory of Alaska. It touches upon the activities of almost every Federal agency operating in Alaska and should be of

great value to the committee in the 1950 deliberations.

Fourteenth. A report on the study of the subsistence procurement of the Army for use in the 1950 hearings. The report indicates that corrected procedures can save tremendous sums of money.

These are only a few of the more important studies undertaken by the group. In addition, scores of comparatively minor studies were made of specific units of the Government.

The over-all result was that the committee was able to effect savings or rescissions detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some \$9,800,000,000 in 2 years, making possible a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years, making possible a reduction in our national debt of some \$7,000,000,000, making possible a reduction in our tax burden of \$4,800,000,000, 71 percent of which went to those with incomes of less than \$5,000, some 7,000,000 persons being removed from tax rolls entirely.

It was a fine start, and I agree with the sentiment of a close friend of mine now on the majority side of this great committee, who said to me shortly after our return to Washington in January, that in his opinion the Republicans of the last Congress had made a fine start with this staff, and that his only criticism was that the staff had not been large enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be surprised, in view of this record, to know that this staff has been completely abolished. It has been abolished, despite the experience of years, despite the intent of the Reorganization Act, despite the splendid record that it made.

The staff has not only been abolished, it is not only a question of relieving those who served on the staff, the whole theory of a staff responsible only to the Appropriations Committee has been, for the time being, abandoned, and we have gone back to the old idea of asking one executive agency to please investigate the actions of another executive agency, whenever an investigation seems necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that plan has been tried. It is better than nothing. But as long as human nature remains what it is, it will never, in my opinion, get fundamental results. In fact it may tend at times to conceal rather than to disclose.

Real results depend on a permanent, nonpolitical skilled staff, responsible to the Appropriations Committee and to that committee alone.

I want to pay my tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the work done by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. They made a splendid contribution to the Nation in terms of lower prices, in terms of lower taxes, in terms of a stable economy.

I want also to record for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, my opinion that the action taken in abolishing the staff and certain other action taken in connection with the organization of the committee for this Congress is most unfortunate.

That action was taken contrary to the views of the minority members of the committee. In fact, it was taken with-

out allowing any minority member of the committee the opportunity to question, to debate, or to offer to amend any one of a half dozen resolutions that were adopted in the full committee.

I regret the manner in which the action was taken. In my judgment, it was unworthy of the traditions of the great Committee on Appropriations.

I regret the action taken, because, in my judgment, it is likely to cost the people of this Nation literally billions of dollars.

#### THE BILL IN GENERAL

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the bill under consideration.

As you know, it calls for something less than \$500,000,000 of appropriations. The budget sent it up here in the sum of about \$480,000,000. The committee has taken off \$14,000,000.

If I had my way, there would be further reductions. If I had my way, the restrictions and limitations, which it is proposed to cancel, and which have been referred to first by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and then by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], would remain the law of the land.

I want to mention in passing that the committee has allowed in full the amount of approximately \$5,000,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and the Employment Service to give the Service an average of 38,000 employees as compared with an average of 35,000.

This situation has not been satisfactory. It has been charged, among other things, that the allocation to the several States of the over-all sum made available by the Congress has been very inequitable, that State set-ups which have striven to operate with efficiency and economy have been penalized, while others operating on an inefficient and extravagant basis have had more staff than they should fairly have been allotted.

This amount provided, in my judgment, is entirely inadequate. The Bureau of the Budget has ordered a complete investigation. The Appropriations Committee has also ordered a complete investigation.

I have no doubt that further funds will be available for this activity either in this bill or subsequently in the light of the two investigations.

#### TVA STEAM PLANT

The principal item of controversy in this bill is the one already referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

It is the proposal by TVA that this Congress make available some \$3,000,000 as a first installment on a gigantic steam plant to cost ultimately some \$84,000,000 and to produce some 375,000 kilowatts, having a capacity sufficient, it has been said, for all of the needs, both commercial and domestic of perhaps a million people; a steam plant requested for the purpose of meeting the prospective power needs of the TVA industrial users.

The identical proposal, Mr. Chairman, was before this House last summer. Exhaustive hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations. Thorough debate took place on this floor on two

separate occasions. On each occasion the proposal was voted down by a record vote.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, for the Congress to reverse at this time the decisions it made at that time.

I do not want to repeat in detail the arguments presented to this House last summer. I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, however, that the decision of the House was based on fundamental grounds which transcend in importance any single steam plant at any single project. I do want to say, also Mr. Chairman, that we are not discussing a theory; that this is an intensely practical question in which there is very great interest.

There is widespread opposition to embarking on the policy implied in the construction of this plant. If proof of this were needed, I may say that I understand that over 90 different organizations of businessmen, taxpayers, and others appeared in opposition to the proposal last summer. I may add that in the course of the very brief hearings conducted in respect to this bill we were confronted by the chambers of commerce of perhaps three-quarters of the States of the Union, by the National Chamber of Commerce, and by representatives of other business organizations who registered their emphatic opposition to the policy implied in the request now before us.

What are the broad grounds of objection, Mr. Chairman?

There are several of them.

In the first place, while it is clear that the TVA Act authorized the generation and marketing of electric energy incidental to navigation or flood control, it is exceedingly doubtful that there is any authority whatsoever for TVA to enter into the generation and marketing of commercial power which has nothing to do with navigation or with flood control.

But for the rule adopted by this House it would be my view that a point of order would clearly have lain against the present requested appropriation for that reason. I regret that the rule was obtained, because, in my judgment, the matter of policy here involved is far too important to be determined in the course of the consideration of an appropriation bill.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, if the act be construed to give the necessary authority, then there is the further question of whether the act is constitutional. Time does not permit going into that legal question this afternoon. But I would like to quote again Mr. Justice Reed when he was Solicitor General some years ago, in appearing before the United States Supreme Court in a case concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Mr. Justice Reed, then Solicitor General, said:

From the bench and at the bar the controversy has come down to a question of this kind: If we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we determine that this act, while stating that it is for navigation, national defense, and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, aside from these legal questions there remains the broad question of national policy by which we are confronted.

The TVA could conceivably earn a profit even if it was organized and run like a legitimate business. It could at least eliminate all unfair competition by paying the legitimate costs of operation.

But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Here we have the TVA representing an over-all investment of \$780,000,000, of which some \$480,000,000 represents investment in power alone. Until recently TVA made no proper arrangements for amortization or depreciation. As has been pointed out, its interest burden has been practically negligible and the tax burden which it bears is estimated at between 10 and 20 percent of that borne by a private company in a similar situation.

Its net income of about \$17,000,000 is not even sufficient to pay the interest charges and the amortization charges which would be normally borne by a private company operating in this field of industry.

However you figure them, the alleged costs of operation by TVA are far less than the actual costs paid by a private industry in the same field and the difference is paid by all of us in terms of subsidy.

Now until this time TVA has limited itself to dealing with power incidental to its proper functions of navigation and flood control, and it has acted under a statutory provision requiring that insofar as power is available, it should be made available to preferred customers, such as municipalities and cooperatives.

Now we see the TVA coming before the Congress and saying, in substance: "Gentlemen, there is going to be an increase in demand in the TVA area. We are not going to be able to meet that demand. Whether you intended it originally or not, we believe that there is a clear obligation on the shoulders of TVA to meet the total demand from the TVA area, whatever that demand may amount to, and whether or not we have enough power incidental to navigation and flood control to meet that demand. And, if you agree, you must give us the essential steam generating capacity to meet that demand which is in excess of the incidental power that we shall have at our disposal."

That, Mr. Chairman, is a radical departure from the policy heretofore followed. It is a very far-reaching departure, in my opinion, and for one I am opposed to it.

I am opposed to it because from the record it is clear that there is ample capacity available today and for the next 3 or 4 years to take care of the demands of all preferred customers.

If you look at the tables in the record, you will find that those preferred customers only used about 3,300,000,000

kilowatt-hours out of a total of 14,000,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1945; that they only used about 6,050,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of 16,500,000,000 available in 1948, and that it is estimated that they will only use about 9,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of about 19,600,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1952. The balance goes to industrial users and to public utilities in adjoining areas which are subject to control.

Were it not for the industrial users there would be more than sufficient to take care of the preferred customers. And, Mr. Chairman, there are vacant stalls today in various dams that are available for additional hydroelectric units.

What TVA is really asking is additional subsidized power to meet the prospective needs of its big industrial users, like the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and the Tennessee Copper Co., and others.

That Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is unfair to the men and women of the rest of the country who, on the basis of present operations, must subsidize the power that is used.

I am opposed to this proposal, Mr. Chairman, because the needs of these industrial users do not have to be met by TVA—they can be met in various ways. If the construction of a steam plant is necessary, the simplest way is to let the industrial users construct and pay for the plant just as they would in any area outside of the TVA area.

Let TVA limit itself to its prescribed role, and the industrial users and the cities concerned will supply the necessary steam-plant construction for other power, in my opinion, in very short order.

Failure to do this is unfair to other sections of the country with and for whose industries TVA-subsidized power under present conditions competes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this proposal because I believe that Congress never intended that TVA should go into the power business over and above its incidental power, and because I believe if the precedent is established, there is no end or limitation in sight to unfair Government-subsidized competition with private industry.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should the people of the West, the North, and the East, rich and poor alike, be compelled to pay through higher prices and higher taxes for power used by the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other multi-million-dollar plants in or near the TVA territory?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should other parts of the country be compelled to subsidize TVA industry which competes with and for their own industries at home?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should we adopt a precedent which assures a widespread unfair competition with private industry in this field of industry, which may lead to complete nationalization in this field of industry, and which, if proper in this field, may be proper in any other industrial field in America?



I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is any present authority in TVA to generate or market electrical energy not incidental to navigation and flood control, in competition with private business.

If, however, the assertion of that authority, in spite of statutory and constitutional difficulties, is to be approved by this Congress, then let us eliminate the present elements of unfair competition immediately.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will stand by its position in this matter. I hope that the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to, when offered to this House, will be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, without a doubt, the things the Republicans in Congress are trying to do to bring order out of chaos in many departments of government will fall on deaf ears like a voice crying in the wilderness, but we must never give up the fight. We know only too well by now what is in the back of the minds of the party in power, because we had an excellent demonstration of that in the full committee about 3 weeks ago when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the full Committee of Appropriations, refused to recognize a single minority member when we attempted and tried our best to get Mr. CANNON's attention. We had some amendments to offer, but, believe it or not, he did not even look our way. They put through their resolutions one right after the other and then immediately ordered the previous question, which shut off debate and when they got all their resolutions adopted they had someone of their own party move to adjourn, and they adjourned without paying the slightest notice to the 18 minority-party members present.

In this America of ours, the minority has always had a voice or a say, or at least had an opportunity to express its opinions in Congress and out of Congress until now. Now they are patterning after Uncle Joe Stalin and his one-party rulers. That is what the gentleman from Missouri is doing, and the gentleman is sitting right here in front of me on the floor of this House. If he does not like it, let him stand and defend himself before his colleagues and the American people.

I am waiting for the answer of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Then I saw another performance, and it is almost too disgraceful to mention; just last week in a subcommittee meeting, the same gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] muffled one of the finest, most able Representatives of the people in Congress and did his voting for him. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had not heard a word of the testimony that had been given by the departments, but he came in and did the voting for this member of his party. Now, that is something to think about, folks. I want every American to know about this, so they will know the course we are taking. We are taking the direct course to a

one-party rule in America like many other nations have, including Russia. Then, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had the boldness to say that he was going to sit in with every Subcommittee of Appropriations during the marking-up of each bill. He is going to see to it that the program they have concocted to destroy our American liberties is going through regardless of any and all opposition.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this moment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. If he has any defense.

Mr. WHITE of California. I have a defense of the party, if the gentleman will yield to me for just one moment.

Mr. JENSEN. All right then, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I ask the gentleman if he recalls the time during 1946 when the Gearhart committee of the Ways and Means Committee had star-chamber proceedings and brought out legislation under gag rule and not a word could be heard in committee or on the floor.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, my dear colleague—gag rule—you accuse the Republican Party of gag rule? Say, the gentlemen on that side of the aisle have for years, without end, gagged the Republican Party or tried to gag us until it became a national scandal. Now, I do not care to hear any more of that kind of stuff from the gentleman who just recently arrived, or from anyone on that side of the aisle, because we know the sad story about them.

Last year the Eightieth Congress saw fit to put a limitation on the amount of money that could be spent for force account. Force account means that the Bureau of Reclamation can hire anyone they see fit, to do any job they see fit, regardless of how large the job is, whether \$100 or \$50,000,000, without letting a contract or asking for bids.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, in this bill appears a provision which would strike out all of those limiting provisions which were placed in the bill last year and again let them run wild and do anything they like with the taxpayer's money.

More actual construction work for hydroelectric power, transmission lines, and irrigation has been performed in the last year and a half than has ever been performed in three times that length of time before in the history of this Nation. Why? Because we put their house in order. We said, "Go to work and stop wasting money and time." Now if there is anybody who wants to deny that, let them stand. They cannot do it, because what I have said is the truth. Yet they travel all over the country. Yes, from the President on down—saying that the

Republican Party had almost completely destroyed the reclamation program—when the facts are that the Eightieth Congress appropriated twice as much money than had ever been appropriated before for the development of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my brief remarks I wish to express my appreciation for the action of the Appropriations Committee for having approved the amount of \$2,500,000 for the beginning of construction of the new Johnsonville steam plant and \$450,000 for two additional hydroelectric generating units at existing TVA dams. It is good economy for the Government to make full use of the natural resources of its investment. The existing power facilities in the Tennessee Valley serve a large area, which is rapidly developing, and with this natural progress and development there has been a great increase in the consumption of electric power.

More than 5,000,000 people are supplied by TVA power and are dependent upon this great Federal project for their source of electric power. It has been estimated by the Tennessee Valley Authority and by other reliable testimony that we are facing a power shortage in the entire valley served by TVA. The people of this section of America are confronted with a different situation than that which is generally the case. Here the only source of power is the Government agency. Private utilities voluntarily sold their properties and moved out. There is no other source of power. Industry needs additional power. The great REA program is in need of additional power to supply the applications that are now currently on file. Electric cooperatives have entered into agreements and contracts to furnish rural power to thousands of farmers, but due to the power shortage the Government has not been able to carry out these commitments. I have said on the floor of this Congress on previous occasions that the greatest guarantee that we shall continue as a free and independent people is for the Congress by appropriate action to place on the statute books of this country laws which will build up the rural and farm life of America. The farmers have never failed us in war or in peace, and we must not fail them now.

The development of this great area in America will create good business; the farmers and public generally will increase their use of electrical appliances and equipment in their homes, and will thereby create an outlet and market for electrical appliances and devices and gadgets of every kind, which are produced all over America. This natural market will, therefore, employ idle labor, and will stimulate production, and will in no sense of the word injure our American industry.

In my mind there is a big object, which we may overlook in this bill under consideration. This Congress has been

called upon to appropriate billions of dollars in an effort to stop the onrushing tide of communism, which was calculated by some people to be on the march throughout the Continent of Europe, and on into the far eastern world. With that dark shadow casting its shadows on the lives, happiness and hopes of millions of peace-loving people throughout the world, we as a Congress have a responsibility to preserve the national defense of this country. When we spend billions to help little nations fortify themselves against our common enemy, then does it not follow as a matter of clear logic, that we should spend the necessary amount of money to build the power facilities to supply electric power to insure that the great atomic energy development, which is located at Oak Ridge, Tenn., has the required amount of electric current at all times to run and operate this great project on a full production basis.

The history of World War II shows that we had, and now have great and vast Federal agencies in the Tennessee Valley, which played an important role in the production of war material in the recent war. The Oak Ridge plant, the Alcoa Aluminum Mills, the Tennessee Eastman, the Holston Ordnance, and North American and Bemberg Rayon corporations are some of the big manufacturing concerns that contributed in a large way to our national defense.

In view of the world situation, I believe that this country should have the finest air force on earth. We should have an air force that can circle and police the world if necessary. The record shows that TVA at one time furnished the power that was used to make 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our war planes. The Eightieth Congress voted for a 70-group air force program. We cannot afford to face a situation which would deprive these great facilities of the necessary power during slack seasons to continue the full operation of these vital defense factories, which are a part of our announced preparedness program.

We are not considering a new principle here today. The Government has appropriated the money to build steam plants on a number of occasions. The Watts Bar steam plant built by TVA is an example of a steam plant. In fact when the private companies owned their own plants in Tennessee, they not only sold their water plants, but these companies sold steam plants to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a corporation created by act of Congress on May 18, 1933. It was established to improve navigation and to provide for flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the valley; to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley has accomplished these purposes by developing dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River Basin and its tributaries. It has engaged in the generation of hydroelectric power.

We should not in days of emergency deny to this great publicly owned utility the same right and privilege that is enjoyed by every private business and utility in America. I mean by this that it is a common practice for our large industries, which make use of hydroelectric power to also have as a secondary source of power, a steam plant. In that way an industry is not wholly dependent upon one source of power. A steam plant will, therefore, guarantee a continuous flow of power during a time when hydroelectric power may be curtailed in production because of dry weather, and because of a drying up of the water power in the dams.

In some quarters the legal power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to engage in the erection of a steam plant has been questioned. Under the Constitution the Congress has the power to promote the general welfare and to promote the common good of the people of this country. We are implementing a great program and are giving it the necessary strength and the necessary appropriation to implement the power program so as to meet the needs of the people in this valley. This is no new departure. The Congress from time to time has appropriated money for the great highways of this country. We have developed the forests and waterways of America. We have developed the rivers and harbors, and have developed the canal service to accommodate the commerce flowing all over this land.

We as a nation have encouraged the development of the great reclamation service of the West, which has produced fertile soil, where fruits and vegetables now grow. A great section of the West is rapidly becoming an agricultural and one of the chief bread baskets of America. This same area was at one time a place of dust and wastelands. This transition and new development has added to the wealth and productivity, as well as to the progress and happiness, of the people. Therefore, I want to say, in conclusion, that I have seen the benefit the people have derived from TVA, and I am happy that the Congress is approaching this subject from a nonpartisan and national point of view. I am happy that we are recognizing the great public interest involved and that we do not propose to place a lid upon the progress and upon the advancement of an area consisting of approximately seven States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to be recorded, as I have been in the past, that I am not opposed to the development of power in the river basins of our country by the Federal Government. With the demand that exists all over the Nation for power I think that is essential and necessary. What I am opposed to and where we divide with minds in this body is the projection of the Federal Government into the sale of power as a private distributor and in competition with investment already made by the citizens of this coun-

try and already serving the area where these new projects may come into being.

In a hearing before the Committee on Public Works last year and the year before it was developed that if the Federal Government were compelled to pay the taxes, overhead expenses, interest involved in borrowing money, payment of dividends, the Federal Government could not produce 1 kilowatt of power cheaper than private industry and private investment is now producing it in this country. It is because of that unfair advantage by the Federal Government in projecting itself into the power field in competition with private enterprise that sooner or later if the step we are taking today is extended and expanded private enterprise in the power field will vanish from the American scene. That is socialization of industry. If it is so desirable to socialize electric power, will someone get up on this floor and tell the Nation why it should not be projected into all the other activities of American life—communications, transportation, mines, food, clothing, and others. But after we have done all of that, we will have brought to America an ideology that is foreign to the standards and the basic principles upon which this Nation stands, and the Republic of the United States will disappear.

Congress is now confronted with a proposal that the Tennessee Valley Authority construct and operate a steam electric generating plant. This is unusual, and in fact an unprecedented request. The Federal Government in the past has constructed and operated steam plants, but in every such case the legal background for such authorization has been on the basis of national defense. The classic example, of course, is the still existing steam plant at Muscle Shoals, created under the War Powers Act of 1916 and constructed for the purpose of the manufacture of nitrates for ammunition. Similarly, in 1940, a large steam plant was constructed at Watts Bar, Tenn., as a part of the equipment of the TVA for the purpose of augmenting its generating capacity to meet national defense demands. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, has one of the largest steam electric plants in the world, wholly devoted to generating power for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

With none of these projects has any objection ever been raised as they obviously follow the familiar pattern necessary to national preservation.

In the case of the pending proposal for the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the matter of national defense is not used as a justification.

The lack of such justification indicates that the administration is prepared to establish a new precedent: That the Federal Government shall accept as a normal function the business of producing and selling power commercially, not as an incident to the control of rivers, but as an out-and-out business, not incidental to any other necessary and constitutional functions of government. The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects.



Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

## [Roll No. 12]

Abbitt	Fisher	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Gillmer	Pfeifer
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Joseph L.
Andresen, August H.	Gorski, Ill.	Philbin
Arends	Granger	Plumley
Baring	Green	Poulson
Bates, Mass.	Hall	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Leonard W.	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Ramsay
Blackney	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Bland	Havener	Richards
Bonner	Hébert	Riehlman
Boykin	Heffernan	Rivers
Breen	Heseltan	Sabath
Brooks	Hinshaw	Sanborn
Bryson	Hoffman, Ill.	Sasser
Buckley, Ill.	Irving	Scrivner
Buckley, N. Y.	Jackson, Calif.	Shafer
Bulwinkle	Jacobs	Sheppard
Barleson	Jenison	Short
Burnside	Jenkins	Smith, Ohio
Carlyle	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Celler	Judd	Somers
Chipperfield	Kennedy	Stockman
Clemente	Kilburn	Taylor
Coffey	Kilday	Teague
Cole, N. Y.	Lesinski	Thomas, N. J.
Coudert	Lind	Towe
Cox	Linehan	Van Zandt
Crosser	McCulloch	Velde
Curtis	Magee	Vinson
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Welch, Calif.
DeGraffenried	Miles	Williams
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Doyle	Monroney	Wilson, Okla.
Durham	Morrison	Wilson, Tex.
Ellsworth	Morton	Withrow
Elston	Moulder	Woodhouse
Feighan	Nixon	Woodruff
Fellows	Norblad	Zablocki
	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 309 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted a few minutes ago that the proposal pending before the Congress is unique in some other respects.

The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects. For example, it is presented as a deficiency appropriation. Until now, deficiencies have always been appropriated only for the continuance of enterprises and projects already previously authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated. In this case the Congress not only has not authorized and appropriated money for the steam plant, but in fact only a few months ago Congress by roll-call votes—two in the House of Representatives—flatly rejected the proposal

to construct this very same project. No one has yet explained satisfactorily how a deficiency appropriation could be made for a project never originated and for which no money was ever appropriated.

There is a strong doubt that such an appropriation would be legal inasmuch as there is nothing in the organic TVA Act as amended which permits the construction of new steam plants. Even if the act did so provide, it would be patently unconstitutional. The TVA was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River so that its facilities for navigation would be improved and so that its floods would be controlled. As Senator Norris once said, "These are the constitutional pegs upon which the Tennessee Valley Authority Act must rest under the commerce clause of the Constitution."

There must be some lurking doubts as to the acceptance of this long step in the direction of socialism in the minds of its proponents. Otherwise the problem would have been approached in the normal parliamentary manner and under normal parliamentary procedure. The atmosphere of candor is lacking in the procedure by which this bill arrives before the House.

On February 3, 1949, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, acting either in that capacity or as chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to obtain debate on the bill on February 4. He appeared before the Rules Committee without a bill. The Appropriations Committee itself had not met to discuss the matter. As I understand it there had not been a formal marking up of the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee—although this may have happened among the majority members. Thanks to the wise decision of the senior Member of this House, both in age and in consecutive legislative experience—the chairman of the Rules Committee—the proposal was given short shrift.

In my long service in this House I recall no incident where the chairman of a committee requested a rule of the Rules Committee before his own committee had even held a meeting to consider the measure.

This is a house of the representatives of the people of the United States. Whether they bear the label Democrat or Republican, every member of this House is sworn to sustain the Constitution and to put flag and country before partisanship. On that basis every member in this House has a right to resent parliamentary tactics that would have been scorned by the so-called, rubber-stamp congresses of the early New Deal.

A century ago Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. The past century has been the bloodiest, the cruellest, and in many ways the most catastrophic century in the history of mankind. The forces let loose by this evil dream of Karl Marx are reaping their harvests down to the present day. Only now a cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church awaits his fate at the hands of a Marxian court because he placed God before the Soviet Caesars. For his courage he may hang, or spend his life in a

convict's cell, or in the mercy of this Marxian court, his term may be shortened. Marxism in Hungary is no different than Marxism in America, except in degree.

Socialism is a complete word. It needs no qualification. An activity of government is either socialistic or it is not socialistic.

This continent was peopled by men and women whose whole philosophy is a rejection of socialism and the planned state idea as conceived by Karl Marx. It was pioneered by men and women who believe in God, and in America.

This small item in the deficiency appropriation calling for the beginning of construction of a steam plant for the TVA is little in itself, but the potentialities as a precedent can involve enormous sums as the curse of socialized power spreads like a creeping paralysis over the economy of our Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to stress an amendment which I will present when the bill is read for amendment. It is to page 6, line 24. I shall urge there striking out "\$4,987,000" and the insertion in lieu thereof of "\$14,000,000."

On page 4 of the committee report, under "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service," it states that the Budget estimate, \$4,987,000, is being recommended for this item. There follows:

It is believed that the amount herein recommended, together with an increased application of flexibility as between the unemployment compensation and employment services should enable the States to make some headway in reducing the present backlog of work.

The concluding paragraph reads:

The committee is advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the present estimate is based on work loads as of November 30, 1948—

I stress that date—

and that it is at the present time reviewing developments since that date.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] earlier today told us that an investigation is pending by the Committee on Appropriations, as it is by the Bureau of the Budget, to ascertain the amount of additional funds that would be necessary in this particular category and to make other pertinent recommendations.

I commend the investigations by the Committee on Appropriations and the Bureau of the Budget; however, it is my desire to bring to the notice of the Committee of the Whole House some facts subsequent to November 30, 1948, which indicate a need for immediate action, and a larger appropriation now. I quote at this time from the Hartford, Conn., Courant of Friday, January 28, 1949. The headline is "State jobless at high point for 10 years—Compensation claims of 44,364 last week up by 4 percent".

State Labor Commissioner John J. Egan said Thursday that claims for unemployment compensation payments are at the highest point in 10 years with the exception

of the reconversion period at the close of the war.

Claims last week totaled 44,364, about 4 percent above the preceding week and 85.3 percent above a year ago.

New claims total 7,821, a rise of 800 above the preceding week and 107 higher than new claims a year ago.

Bridgeport continues to lead the State in the number of unemployed, with 7,508 claims for unemployment payments last week. Claims in other cities were New Haven, 7,172; Hartford, 4,605; Waterbury, 4,374, and Stamford, 2,953.

About 650 workers were laid off by textile mills in the Norwich area due to lack of orders. Lay-offs were also reported in the casters, electrical parts, turbine, screw machine, metal products, tire, lumber, and carpeting industries.

To bring that a little more up to date, I desire to quote from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of February 9, 1949, which carried this very imposing headline: "City's jobless double in month; now at 7,000—Survey indicates trend to shorter workweek—Smaller shops hardest hit—Uncertainty over future, seasonal lay-offs blamed for mounting idle total." This article is very interesting as much as it is startling and alarming. I sincerely hope it is not the recording of a definite trend of affairs in the days just ahead of us. I ask you to give it your attention:

Unemployment in New Haven has doubled in the last month. There are 7,000 workers unemployed as of today. About 3,500 who were working a month ago are not working now.

My colleagues, I am not reading any dispatches from 1932 or 1933 or any of the so-called depression years. This is February 9, 1949. The article continues:

The round-number figures were made public today by Mrs. Alice Marshall, manager of the New Haven branch office of the Connecticut State Employment Service.

Seasonal lay-offs can account for some of it. Finishing of building jobs without acquiring new construction contracts has left many workers stranded in the city, and that accounts for more.

But a good share of the unemployment, according to Mrs. Marshall, "comes about in lay-offs of from one to a dozen men, not only in the larger plants, but in New Haven's numerous small shops."

#### WORKWEEK CUT

In addition to swollen unemployment figures working hours showed a trend to cut back from overtime to the 40-hour week. In some places the workweek is under 40 hours.

There are a number of examples given here in this news item and I cite some as I continue reading the New Haven Register:

For example, the New Haven Clock Co., hard hit by importation of cheap Swiss clock movements, February 1 went on a 4-day week. That reduced by 20 percent the income of 1,000 people.

The American Steel & Wire Co., employing 1,000 went on a 4-day week in some departments, affecting 200 men. S. B. Metcalf said, "Business has fallen off, and we are going to cut back on hours rather than lay off men. We will do that until it hits a 3-day week, if necessary."

#### SMALL SHOPS HIT

Mrs. Marshall said it was in New Haven's numerous small shops that the cut-back was most apparent. "When a firm that employs

15 or 20 men lays off 2 or 3, that adds up. And when a company which employs 500 men lays off 15 instead of a usual seasonal 10, that is 5 men out of a job, and it adds up."

Most men laid off, she said, "hope they will be taken on again soon and the manufacturers do too." But they are not on a definite call-back basis.

Mrs. Marshall cited factors which manufacturers think operate adversely. They included uncertainty in regard to taxes, price changes in consumers' goods, foreign competition in some lines such as the clock business.

To bring the attendant facts still more up to date, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Committee to a release from the Connecticut State Labor Department, which was released on February 9, 1949, for the morning papers of February 10. I read from that release:

Reaching its highest point since the reconversion lay-offs in 1945, the number of jobless claimants for unemployment insurance benefits in Connecticut rose to 49,822 during the week ended February 5. Labor Commissioner John J. Egan stated today. This was 9 percent more than a week ago and 101 percent over the 24,793 who filed a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Committee that this is ample evidence for increasing this particular deficiency appropriation at this time without waiting for the investigations of the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget Bureau, which I am sure will substantiate what I have said not only for my district, which is the entire State of Connecticut, but also throughout the United States. May I ask for your favorable consideration of my amendment when it is offered under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask if there is any appropriation in this bill for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is not. The appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities comes out of the contingent fund of the House and there is no money carried for that purpose here. I believe that that is correct.

Mr. CANNON. There is no money involved in this bill for that committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very vital that that money should be expended by the Congress for these investigations of subversive activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the money has already been appropriated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But I wanted to draw attention to the importance of it.

I want to read to the Congress a letter that came to me this morning. This is one letter. I have received a great many

threats recently. This letter begins "Valentine Day." It reads:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Here is a valentine for you. Lay off your activities against us now, or we will get you. Who are we? We are the Nazis. We are the loyal supporters of Hitler. Long may he live. Down with the Israelites. Down with the Jews.

Then it reads: Signed "The Nazis."

I bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the House because I have received a great many threats recently. I warn the House and the country that not only communism stalks in the United States today but also nazism and Hitlerism. There are disloyal, subversive persons in the United States. They should be sent from the shores of America. No effort should be spared to remove them. They appear in strange and unexpected places. I believe they will be caught.

This letter will be turned over to the FBI, as well as other information that I have in my possession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

##### Miscellaneous items

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949, the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items" for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for purchase of new or used typewriters at prices which do not exceed prices established under the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call the attention of the committee to page 3 of the bill under the title "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building, Senate and House Roofs and Chambers."

I am calling this to the attention of the committee in order that I may give you a brief summary of what has taken place relative to the improvement of these Chambers.

Several years ago a special committee was appointed by the Speaker, with the thought of improving the interior of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to serve as the ranking member on that particular committee, then as chairman of that particular committee, and today as the ranking minority member of the committee, under the chairmanship of the capable gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

We have taken the position for some years that we would hold in abeyance any construction on these Chambers so that we might give to those individuals out in our respective districts the opportunity to obtain building material which is necessary for them to construct homes



which are so badly needed. We also took into consideration the high construction costs and the high material costs, if you please, feeling that possibly at a later date these material costs would be less, and possibly at sometime we might get into a depression and have an unemployment program whereby we would have our plans ready to immediately step into the construction and the remodeling and improvement of these Chambers. That was the policy of your committee prior to the present time. We also objected during that past period of allowing this construction to be done on what is known as a cost-plus basis. Some of us are of the firm conviction that all should be given an opportunity to bid on the project, should be given an opportunity to have their day in court, so to speak, rather than to continue further on that philosophy and method of the Federal Government whereby we are developing a policy of letting contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. When you go back to your private business I am certain that if you had a house to build or some other structure that you would ask for bids on it; then you would get value received for the dollar you spent. On a cost-plus basis, as set forth in this bill, you seldom know what your costs will be until the project is completed.

The question arises in our minds, just how much the repairs on this building, on this Chamber, will cost if we get into the category set forth in this bill of cost-plus-a-fixed fee. We have heard for quite some time that we who are members of the Legislative Committee should be careful and always protect our rights. Here is an appropriation measure that contains a definite legislative provision. I will quote from the bill:

The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts—

Please note—

including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of that act.

I may call to your attention the fact that previously we had authorized and appropriated \$585,000 for the remodeling of this Chamber. Approximately one-half of that amount has been spent to date for plans, designs, and specifications; or approximately \$292,500. This legislation gives further authorization and an appropriation of \$2,274,500; and a contract is to be awarded, if you please, on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

We did not have any meetings of the special committee until this morning we were called into session by the chairman of our committee. He presented to us a letter to sign; and I should like to read it to you. This is a letter dated February 15, 1949, today, and on the bottom of it appears this statement: "Members of House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress,"

and then there is supposed to be the signature of the House committee. It is addressed to Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN—

Mr. Lynn, by the way, is the national architect. He handed us this letter for us to sign, a letter which I believe he had written and addressed to himself. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN: Subject to the enactment of the necessary legislation and appropriation in the First Deficiency Act, 1949, you are hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts and to incur such other obligations as may be necessary for the reconstruction of the roof over the House wing of the Capitol and improvement of the House Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas included in the House project as approved by the House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, in a total amount of not to exceed \$2,567,000.

The contracts may be let on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to such extent and in such manner as in your judgment is to the best interest of the Government.

You are further authorized to award the general contract for the House project on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore, Md., presently employed under contract of October 23, 1948, as the general contractor for the reconstruction of the roof over the Senate wing of the Capitol and improvement of the Senate Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas.

Allow me to divert a moment and call your attention to the fact that this is on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. In this letter we are giving Mr. Lynn the authority to enter into a contract with one individual, if you please, the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore.

Now, if I may go on with the letter of instructions that the committee received:

The committee authorizes the award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co., without further competitive bidding, for the following reasons, predicated on the urgency of the time element:

(a) The materials and equipment required for the House project cannot be fabricated and delivered to the site in time to permit the start of construction work on July 1, 1949, unless orders for the same are placed immediately upon the approval of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

(b) Inviting of competitive bids and sub-bids for the House project, including bid analyses, conferences, and other details necessary prior to contract award, would cause too great a loss of time to permit scheduling, fabrication, and delivery of the required materials and equipment to the site by July 1, 1949.

(c) Utilization, insofar as practicable, of Senate subcontract bids for the House project at the same price levels used for the Senate project, which prices are the result of comparatively recent competitive bidding, will enable the House materials and equipment, which are similar in character to the Senate materials and equipment, to be included in the Senate production schedules, thereby expediting fabrication and enabling the maintenance of construction progress schedule for the House work on the same basis as the Senate work.

(d) Award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co. will eliminate the time losses that would otherwise be entailed not only by the securing of competitive bids and the possible necessity of having to work out the details of contract

negotiations with another general contractor, but entailed also by the details necessarily incident to negotiations with different subcontractors than those employed for the Senate project, and the working out of new production schedules and other procedures.

Then there is a space for the members of the committee to sign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am reading this whole detailed report because I firmly believe this committee should know about the whole procedure. I read the letter that was given to us in all fairness by Mr. Lynn, the Architect. It is entirely up to this committee. If you want to let the contract for the remodeling and repairing of this Chamber on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, it is in this bill. If you pass it as it is then you are giving complete authority and really a directive, to this special committee to enter into an agreement and award the contract to this one company on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman state how many members of the committee have signed that letter?

Mr. MCGREGOR. None of the members of the committee have signed it yet because the Member speaking raised the question this morning whether or not we had any authority to bind this Congress to the expenditure of over \$2,000,000, without further enabling legislation. It was suggested that we get a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, citing his opinion before deciding whether or not we should sign this letter to Mr. Lynn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, these are the facts and it is up to the committee to decide what they want done.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING, SENATE AND HOUSE ROOFS AND CHAMBERS

Capitol Building: For an additional amount to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry forward the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), and July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 72), \$2,274,500. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of

section 2 of that act: *Provided*, That the amounts so approved by such committee may be obligated in full prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: Page 3, line 6, strike out all of the paragraph.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment is offered so that each and every one of you will be given an opportunity to decide whether or not you want the remodeling done which will cost, in addition to what has been allocated, \$2,274,500. This amendment would simply strike out that particular section of the deficiency bill which gives an authorization for the remodeling of this chamber and the adjoining cloak rooms. An authorization to be established under the legislation on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I am certain that the other members of the committee, on which it is my privilege to serve, will not object to allowing you to decide whether or not you want to continue that procedure in Federal construction.

Again I reiterate my previous statement, if this amendment is turned down, the repairs of this section of the Capitol will, at least, be temporarily delayed. The procedure that we have carried for a number of years is that we should not repair at this time and allow the material, and that which is necessary for the repairs, to go to the individual who is having a difficult time to find material and labor to build a house. I am leaving it for your consideration whether or not you want to authorize a contract being entered into on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the extent of \$2,274,500 for the repair of these chambers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand that neither the gentleman nor the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] agreed with this program?

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have not agreed with the program, nor have we disagreed with it, I will say to the gentleman from New York. We gave consideration to it this morning. The question was raised whether or not we should sign the letter to Mr. Lynn, which has been previously referred to. The question was also raised whether or not we should enter into a contract of a cost-plus nature to the extent of \$2,274,500. I want to be perfectly fair; a similar arrangement has been made in the Senate. They are following through on a cost-plus basis, but we have always taken the position that we are not going to do it on this side.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I will not say that it is in the testimony, but I understood when this matter was before the committee that the gentleman's committee had approved it. Now, if that is not so, that is a different picture.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will say to the gentleman that we have not approved it. We had no meeting until this morning, and the statement referred to was handed to us, and we—I think in all fairness to

those who have honored us with that responsibility—refused to sign the statement, and that is the reason I am taking the floor here today so that the committee may know what is incorporated in this legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman in a position to state whether there is an emergent condition here which should be cured immediately or as soon as possible?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will answer that by repeating the statement that our good friend, the minority leader, made, "It is unsightly but safe."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just exactly what will be our situation? I am tired of this bandywork being over my head and destroying the symmetry and beauty of this Chamber. I have talked to the Architect of the Capitol and he says this work can be done in 5 months. If you strike out this paragraph, what will be our situation? Are we going to get this work done?

Mr. MCGREGOR. May I say to the Speaker that it will require approximately a year to complete the whole project, and it would have to be done in two 5- or 6-months periods, for reasons that I am certain all of us are familiar with. Should we not pass this legislation, it probably would go over until another year, and if you did not decide then to do it then it would go over to another year. It is entirely within our power to authorize its construction at any time.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is just exactly what I think about this. If you strike this out, then no one can tell when this work will be done. Frankly, I do not feel any too safe under this thing. If we are not going to do anything if this is stricken out, then I would certainly be opposed to striking out this paragraph. I think this work ought to be done. I think this Chamber ought to be modernized. I think we ought to have better seats in here.

Mr. MCGREGOR. New seating arrangement is covered in the plans.

Mr. RAYBURN. We ought to have a great many other things. I should like to see this gray painted out and put back to gold, that was around here for so many years and that was so beautiful and so attractive to the eye. I do not like coldness when I can have warmth. I just fear that if you strike out this paragraph we are not going to get this job done in 2 or 5 or 10 years.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Carrying further the statement of our distinguished Speaker it is incorporated in this legislation or at least the plans that if it goes through there will be a different seating arrangement; the plans have been in the Architect's office for many, many months where all can see them. There is a different seating arrangement being arranged for. The acoustical part is being taken care of. The beam work is taken out. The roof is changed. It will be

the privilege of the various Members of Congress to decide what they want to do with the seals of their respective States, because the ceiling will be entirely different.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. If I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] is not opposed to the face-lifting operation but only to the manner in which the operation is to be performed. I agree with the gentleman. Surely there should be no objection to consulting various doctors of architecture. It would be better to consult and successfully operate rather than to operate without consultation and find that instead of effecting a cure, we had only succeeded in deforming.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I certainly want this committee to know just what this section of the bill really does. We are most assuredly closing the door to any competitive bidding and closing the door to any other contractor, and allowing that one to construct on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

I am certain that the other members of the special committee will join me when I say, "We want you to decide."

My personal opinion is that it should not be repaired now in the face of high prices, critical-material shortages, and I certainly do not like, or do I think it is fair to the taxpayers, a cost-plus construction procedure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have just this to say. The Architect of the Capitol—and I think everyone else understands this situation—thinks that it would be so much easier to do both these works at the same time. I fear, and let me express the fear again, that if we do not do this as provided in this bill we will not do anything for some years to come. I have talked with the Architect of the Capitol about this. I think it is his idea that these contracts ought to be carried on at the same time. I do not see why we should not look after our business and our comfort here just as the other body or anybody else does. I hope this provision is not stricken out of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if something could not be done that would result in an amendment that would perhaps do away with this idea of letting the contract on a cost-plus basis to this one contractor, and leave it to the approval of this committee, composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], before a contract is entered into.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not like cost-plus contracts. I believe this is the one way we are going to get this job done within a year or two, to be frank about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.



Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Many of you know of my great concern regarding the danger of possibly destroying valuable American architecture. I have gone all over this problem from its inception. There is absolutely nothing wrong with this ceiling. The original plan was to repair the roof because the Architect and the engineers whom we brought here to Washington at the expense of the Government, to examine the ceiling, found some defects in the iron. Then we feared that a heavy snowfall would cause the roof to cave in because we had an instance where a heavy snow falling on the roof of a theater caused the death of some people some years ago.

We removed the roof over this Chamber and put up the superstructure and these iron supports for additional safety. However, the ceiling is in excellent condition. There is nothing the matter with it. I have seen some of the proposed plans, and I fear that when they are completed, some valuable American architecture, which should be preserved for posterity, would be removed. Your State seals will be removed. When they get through with this program of face lifting the Capitol of the United States, because there is an apparent defect in the dome where the lip hangs over the cornice, you will find that they are going to remove column after column of historical American architecture. The cornstalk pillars designed by Thomas Jefferson will be removed. Many of the statues, I am told, will be farmed out to the States. I, too, do not like to disagree with my distinguished Speaker, but I believe that we should have this matter reviewed in order that every Member of the House will realize his responsibility in voting for something that at some time they may be sorry for—something that will destroy American architecture which should be preserved for posterity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If this paragraph is stricken out of the bill, is there any reason in the world why we cannot bring in, if necessary, a special resolution after the other body has considered the matter?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no hurry about it at all. We have many, many new Members here who also believe in preserving American architecture. Let them study this program which is designed to streamline the Capitol; to take away the State seals and put in neon lights and make this historic Chamber look like a modern night club.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. What does the gentleman suggest that we do about this matter? This roof has been condemned. What should we do about it?

Mr. STEFAN. The ceiling is intact and in perfect condition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska really think that that is a correct statement?

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am told, sir. I have crawled over every part of the roof that has been removed.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have been told otherwise. I do not know why, if the ceiling is in good condition, why we should have all this steel framework over our heads.

Mr. STEFAN. I would not debate that point with my distinguished Speaker, but I have gone into this matter carefully and I have been told by the Architect that the ceiling is in perfect condition. I have been told that your State seals, from Kentucky and Maine and Ohio, and every State in the Union, would be removed. They have shown me other designs for changing the appearance of this Chamber.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then why is this steel structure erected over us if the ceiling is safe? Why do we have these steel girders supporting the ceiling?

Mr. STEFAN. For the reason of additional protection, since they removed most of the roof, because we are liable to have a snow that would come down on top of the ceiling. You could make this Chamber safe by putting on the roof that they originally wanted to replace. There has been no change in this historic Chamber from the very time it was constructed, except the seating capacity or arrangement. No other change has been made. And yet overnight, Members of the House, you are participating in a program that some day you will regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the original committee, together with Senator CONNALLY, to investigate the roofs of the Chambers. We went up there, and we were astonished. This roof is somewhat similar to a bridge construction. It is up beyond this glass ceiling, and, incidentally, what appears to be plaster overhead is cast iron. That is a cast-iron ceiling that weighs either 80 or 120 tons. I am calling this figure from memory. This bridge roof support is of old-fashioned iron construction, with pins holding the two elements together in the brace of the roof. Those pins were bent, each pin going in two directions, proving to anyone who would look at them that the pins were broken somewhere in between. This roof is dangerous. When it was brought to the attention of the able Speaker of this House as a precautionary measure, we proceeded to put in this beamwork, inside of this Chamber, which I want to explain to the new Members of

the House does not belong in this room and would not be in this room for this period of time, had it not been for the war which came along, and, of course, set all things of this nature aside by reason of its immensity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how long is this bridgework to be in this room? How long are we to sit idly by, when people come to the Capitol, and ask them to hide behind posts to take a look at the House of Representatives, that cannot even put their own Chamber in order without debate such as we have had here this afternoon?

Over and above that, the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol, the Senate Chamber, is smaller than this Chamber, and that roof is in a similar condition, because all of the air-conditioning has been hung in these roofs, among other things up there that were not there originally, adding weight to a condition which made it all the more dangerous, both here and over in the Senate.

The Senate has entered into an agreement with the contractors, and they did it in the Eightieth, Republican Congress, for the repair of their Chamber. They are to vacate the Chamber by the 30th of June of this year. Now, do we want trucks and whistles and hoists out in front for 4 or 5 years, to the inconvenience of the American people when they come to the Capital of the United States, or do we want to step on the gas and get this thing over with? I see no reason why we should not proceed to take the bridgework out of this Chamber. It is very nice for my friend the gentleman from Nebraska to talk about moving a statue or moving something else. They have been moving statues and men around this building for a long time; they have moved them out since I have been here; and I was moved with them once.

Many statues were taken out of the rotunda a few years ago, as you older Members will recall, and it is no longer permitted to place them away from the sides of the room, for they have all been moved closer to the supporting walls, because it was discovered there was a danger from the concentrated weight.

This roof is 90 years old; it was built according to the standards of those days. It should be taken off now just like a chap would shed his ancient cap.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly the description of the structure above us as given both by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Michigan, there is a difference between the ceiling and the ironwork that we see, and the roof itself which is or was above the ceiling. Apparently the condition of the roof itself was responsible for the ironwork. I remember that shortly after I came here this ironwork was put in because we were told that if a heavy snow should come, the ceiling might fall on us; but apparently a distinction should be made between the ceiling, including these sections which carry the State seals, and the structure of the roof above.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We held a brief hearing yesterday. As to the safeness, or the unsafeness, if you choose to call it such, of this ceiling, we have been assured that the roof has been removed. These beams were put in; and as I have said before, and the evidence before our committee will show, it is unsightly but safe.

The gentleman from Michigan said the roof has been here for 80 or 90 years. I might say to my distinguished friend that that section has been moved and was moved when we put in these new beams.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just a minute. If I have time I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Now, personally, I would like to see the seals preserved up here. This morning I read in one of the columns, I think it was in the Washington Post, that under the plan that had been agreed to, if this language should prevail, these seals would be removed.

I should like to know whether the plan as presently contemplated does include the removal of the seals from the ceiling? Could some gentleman of the committee advise me definitely on that point?

Mr. MCGREGOR. As a member of the committee I may say that it has been agreed that the seals will be removed and will be taken care of according to the will of the various State organizations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is if we approve this language.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then our only chance to preserve the seals for the House of Representatives is to take the language out.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Either that or endeavor to get your committee to change the plans of remodeling so that the seals will be retained; but under present plans and specifications the seals will be removed. That is called for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I share the desire of the Speaker to see this work done. We should agree upon a plan for the work and go ahead with it; but if the present plans, as they appear to, mean the removal of the State seals from the Chamber of the House of Representatives I shall be compelled to support the amendment to strike this language from the bill. In voting that way, however, I do not want it understood as meaning that I am opposed to getting rid of this ironwork and the unsafe condition of the Chamber, but rather that I want the seals preserved for the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of this body have taken the trouble to go down to the Architect's rooms and see the plans? I wonder if they know that these two doorways will be changed, that the position of the portraits will be changed, that Brumidi's painting of General Washington and Lord Cornwallis will be removed—Why? Because there must be balance in the Chamber and there is no painting in

the corresponding corner on the other side of the Chamber. Not only will this ceiling of the State seals be destroyed but also all the decorations will be changed. There will be columns on either side of the Speaker's chair that might bury the Speaker behind them. Columns are formal and cold and out of keeping with this present old room so filled with understanding between the Speaker and those of us on the floor. And these are but the simpler changes.

It seems to me a great pity that we in this young country do not see the value to posterity of this great Capitol. A thousand years hence—and we hope this Capitol will still be here—the young people will not bless us if we remove all evidence of ourselves and our methods and our ways of life.

You know well that in the other countries of the world, in the old countries of the world, it is very wonderful to go into their houses of parliament, or whatever they may be called. Redolent of the past they give dignity to all that there transpires—they are living history.

Let me call attention again to the condition between the ceiling and the roof. If the contractors so lack ingenuity that they cannot find ways of making the roof safe over and above this old-fashioned, traditional ceiling, we had better find another contractor!

I too agree with the Speaker in the matter of the removal of our factory construction—but here under these iron beams we fought a war like no other war.

For myself—and I am certain that I speak for the people of this great Republic—I would rather keep the factory supports a little longer than destroy this atmosphere. By all means let us have new chairs, but not new walls. You have not seen the picture of the dull, arched ceiling, the uninteresting design. If you had, you would not lend yourselves to this destruction.

They say we will be able to hear. If we are quiet, we can always hear. Are you so sure the change will do all you say it will?

To use as an argument the removal of these steel struts to strengthen a roof that can be strengthened up above and so destroy an atmosphere that has seen some of the great of our country, within whose walls vibrates something we cannot afford to lose, Mr. Chairman, will deprive those who come after us of a rich heritage they can ill afford to lose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I would like to direct your attention, however, to the fact that before long an analogous situation will no doubt be presented to the Congress. I refer to the situation that involves the historic White House. It is

said on good authority that the present structure could be reduced and a new structure be built to meticulous specifications as to present form at a cost of \$2,000,000. It is further said that to preserve that historic structure as is, with suitable improvements, will cost from six to eight million dollars, and you are going to have to ultimately decide that when the appropriation for that estimate comes before the Congress.

Now, the walls have gone up all over this country at the very thought of destroying that historic structure, and voices have been raised all over this country to preserve it, cost what it may. Now you will have to meet that issue again a little later on.

I am inclined to agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I was here when these atrocious supports were put in this room. As a Member of the House of Representatives I have not suffered any by it. I have seen the plans that are proposed. Far be it from me to attempt to assess whether those plans are the best that could be prepared or not. But, let me tell you that if you vote for this proposal you are going to vote to destroy this Chamber of the House of Representatives as we have known it and as the people have known it for the last 90 years.

Maybe we have reached a point where sentiment means nothing, but in my vote it still does mean something. I would hate to have this Chamber transformed in the manner in which it has been suggested and thus for all time destroy the identity of this Chamber with the historic past. It is more than just a mere changing of the roof, Mr. Chairman. There is more to this situation than just the mere expenditure of this money in order to improve the comfort of people who are involved.

Mr. RAYBURN. Right there, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anyone else during the next 2 years can make any plans for changing this structure unless they consult with the committee of the House named by the Speaker the other day. That committee is composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anybody else could do anything without the approval of that committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I read the language of the bill, it says:

The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts . . . in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so on. I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] that the Architect of the Capitol has already, before the passage of this act, presented a letter of approval of this program to go into ef-



fect, and the whole necessity and urgency is based upon the fact that unless he is immediately authorized to enter into this contract in collaboration with the contract that has been entered into to improve the Senate, that we will not get what we want.

Mr. RAYBURN. The bill goes on to say:

and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so forth.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I understand that, but for all practical purposes does not the Speaker realize, and I am sure he does, that if we pass this appropriation this afternoon, the balance of it is merely perfunctory because the plan has already been submitted to the committee? The committee is prepared to go ahead, and the very basis of it all is speed. We must work in cooperation with this firm of contractors that is doing over the Senate. I wish it could be done that way and preserve this historic Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statements made on this floor by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin. The bill brought before us is a deficiency bill. This is considered so important a matter that we cannot wait for 6 weeks, or whatever the time may be, before an appropriation bill comes before this House in its regular order appropriating \$2,274,500.

If the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, is correct, and it is necessary for the committee still to approve plans, for plans still to be completed, then it seems to me it is primary evidence that it is not necessary for this item to be in a deficiency appropriation bill. It might very well take its proper order. The committee might consider the plans, vote upon them, pass them, and determine the amount of money, for if the plans have not been approved, how does the committee know the amount of money that is necessary?

However, I call attention primarily to two things. One has already been spoken of by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and that is that right downtown, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have a house which does not have the historic associations of the Chamber in which we sit today. Here the laws of the United States have been made. In the other house they have only been carried out. This is the body, this is the building, this is the Chamber, in which United States history has been made. Yet when it comes to repairing the White House, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have evidence before our committee that \$6,400,000 is to be spent on the White House to preserve the White House as it stands, when a like building, similar in every way, better and more modern, could in the words of the head of the Public Buildings Administration be built for half that amount. It seems to me that here, in

this Chamber, is where the historic evidences of the history of this country ought to be preserved.

So let me tell you what England did under exactly the same situation. England during the last war was bombed, bombed thoroughly, bombed as I hope this country may never know what bombing is. The House of Parliament was struck by bombs. The House of Commons was completely destroyed, gutted, nothing left standing except the walls, with everything else open to the air. The chamber of the House of Commons, which goes down in its history and in the hearts of the people of England as this building should go down in the hearts of the people of America, never was big enough, or has not been big enough for generations, to seat all of the members of the House of Commons at one time.

What would have happened in this country? If this is any evidence, architects and committees and Architects of the Capitol and building contractors would immediately have rushed in and said, "Here is our chance. Now let us build a great big room, a great big new room. There isn't anything left. Let us build one that will take all the members of the House of Commons at one time." Did they do that? No. The new House of Commons which is now being built in England is exactly the same size, an exact replica of the room which was bombed during the war.

It seems to me that while this may not be the most important matter to come before this House this session, it is a very important matter. If this Nation is to be preserved, we must look back to some of the principles that were established in this room, and we should be reminded by the room of what those principles were and of their association with the history of the United States.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Am I not correct in believing that this Chamber, this building of our young Republic is the oldest House of Representatives in the world? The British Chamber is younger than this. I think the French Chamber is, and I know of no chamber where the elected representatives of the people meet any place in the world that is as old as this 90-year-old Chamber in which we meet.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am sure we should preserve it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to supplement what the gentleman said about the House of Commons in England. When I was there the Assistant Speaker told us that the reason they did not enlarge the Chamber, or at least one of the pertinent reasons, was that they always have so many people absent, about 100 or 150, that if they enlarge the Chamber, the absence would be so much more noticeable and that they therefore retained the old size.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the gentleman suggesting that, in making

this change, we reduce the size of this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 74, noes 116.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. MCGREGOR.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 78, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. In view of the difference of opinion in the House, I wonder if it would be satisfactory if we just repaired the roof on the Democratic side and let the Republican side stay as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I am not in sympathy with the manner in which the Veterans' Affairs Committee was conducted this morning. A bill of such magnitude was reported out that it might involve as much as \$200,000,000 in the future, and affects thousands of veterans.

This bill was reported with a total hearing time of 7 minutes, having never been seen by many members of the committee prior to the meeting this morning. I shall always object to conducting a committee hearing in this fashion.

I have a very keen interest in the problems of veterans and I am anxious to see this particular bill be given full and adequate consideration by the Members of both Houses. Certainly a bill affecting the very life and welfare of our veterans should be given every consideration and study. The committee, I feel, was being put in a position to place its stamp of approval upon proposed legislation regardless of its feeling in the matter, and without giving the Members a chance to pursue the details in the bill.

Neither was their help asked or their advice requested on what may or may not be best in this legislation. We believe that, because we are on this committee, we are responsible to the veteran and are his voice on matters pertaining to legislation that concern him as well as the public in general. Therefore, it behooves the chairman, as well as the committee members, to familiarize themselves with any measures that are brought before the committee for its action. My 5 years in the service, with 31 months overseas, justify my belief that I have as great an interest in this legislation and in the veterans and their problems as any Member of this Congress. My continued interest in veterans' organizations since my discharge in 1945 further substantiates this.

It was necessary for the members of the committee to decide in 7 minutes what the minimum age would be for a pension, and to vote to exclude the 62-64 age group without an adequate presentation of background data to substantiate this exclusion. Further, the bill provided for the pensioning of those other than honorably discharged from the armed services and gave consideration to non-service-connected disability veterans below the age of 65. The chairman of this committee did not permit me or any other member of the committee the opportunity to ask questions or discuss these facts, but in an arbitrary manner himself called for a roll-call vote. I consider that he has exceeded his authority as chairman and is not providing adequate opportunity for the problems of veterans to be considered, for members of the committee to be heard, or for information to be distributed and assimilated.

#### MR. CORBETT DESIGNATED TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, February 22, 1949.

#### PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week I announced that if the bill (H. R. 782) to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare were reported out of committee, that it would be on the program for this week. The bill is still in the committee; and even if it were reported now, the bill could not come up this week.

With that exception the program is the same as heretofore announced.

With the completion of the bill now under consideration there will follow H. R. 1661, the Export Control Act; House Resolution 66, the investigation of public lands; and House Resolution 75, investi-

gation by the Committee on Education and Labor.

There will be a bill out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Joint Resolution 92, continuing the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships until June 30, 1949.

If these bills are disposed of by Thursday, it is my intention to ask to adjourn over until the following Monday.

#### REPUBLICAN OBJECTORS ON CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I wish to state that the Republican objectors on the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

The objectors on the Private Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News on housing.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Leader-Evening News of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short statement.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for tomorrow be changed to Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 161, and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, ANDREW BIEMILLER, has introduced an identical resolution, calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project—a project which has been the hope and dream of the people of the Great Lakes area for over two decades, and one which is necessary to the future prosperity and welfare of the entire Midwest section of the United States. There is no need to present a detailed analysis of the provisions of this resolution on this occasion. The effect of this bill is to authorize the President to approve the 1941 agreement with Canada to permit the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in cooperation with Canada.

The advantages of constructing the St. Lawrence project are so obvious, so convincing, and so well known that I need mention them only in passing. By building the necessary dams, locks, and canals to remove the obstructions to shipping in the 119-mile bottleneck between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, a great inland seaway of 2,351 miles in length would be made available to ocean shipping. This would mean that the deep-sea vessels from all over the world would be able to steam up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean, and unload their cargoes at the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo.

Such an inland shipping system would mean great savings in transportation costs to consumers and producers alike. It is estimated that the average reduction in transportation costs would be about \$3.90 per ton. Automobiles could be shipped from Detroit at a saving of \$12.24 a ton. Wheat and flour could be shipped from Duluth at a saving of \$1.61 per ton, and could be laid down in Liverpool at 5 to 8 cents less per bushel. Crude rubber could be brought to Detroit at a saving of \$8 per long ton. The dairy products of the Great Lakes region could be transported to the Atlantic coast at a saving of \$4 per ton. In other words, savings in transportation costs would amount to between \$35,000,000 and \$40,000,000 per year, which means that the seaway would pay for itself in transportation savings alone in a few years' time.

The seaway would have the effect of stimulating trade between the east coast and the Midwest. Grain, flour, meat, and ores would flow from the Midwest to the East to be exchanged for the man-



ufactured goods of the East. Trade between the two great regions would grow, employment would rise, and living standards in both areas would improve.

The power facilities of the St. Lawrence project would provide enormous amounts of cheap electric power to relieve the power famine now affecting New York and the New England States. It has been estimated that the United States share of electric power generated by the project would amount to 13,000,000 kilowatts per year at the very low rate of 1 mill per kilowatt. According to the New York Power Commission, St. Lawrence-generated power would save the people of New York some \$26,000,000 per year in reduced power costs, and would allow for the expansion of her retarded industries to employ 50,000 additional workers. The New England States would also benefit in a similar degree.

Just as the savings in transportation costs would pay for the cost of the seaway in a relatively short time, so will the electric power obtained from the project also offset in a few years' time the \$571,000,000 outlay on the part of the United States for its construction.

The case for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is so overwhelming that it is a mystery why anyone would be opposed to it—the mystery is, Why was it not constructed years ago? The project has been an issue in the Congress year after year, and each time its supporters have been disappointed. However, the picture has been changing and support has been growing for the project by leaps and bounds.

An unprecedented series of developments have occurred recently to give the project a new and powerful stature and bring close the day when the Congress must recognize its intrinsic merit. President Harry S. Truman recommended the passage of the seaway measure three times during the month of January of this year, and has listed the seaway as an expenditure item in his 1950 budget. The appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State is important, inasmuch as Mr. Acheson headed State Department activity in support of the project in the past, and he was also the former chairman of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board.

Of equal significance has been the shift in position of the Great Lakes shipping interests. Mr. George Humphrey, of M. A. Hanna Co., has now come out in support of the seaway, and the influential Lake Carriers Association has decided to change its position from bitter hostility to one of neutrality. Shippers and leaders of industry have come to realize that the seaway is essential to the stabilization of the iron and steel industry—the backbone of the American industrial system.

Just as the movement supporting the seaway gathers momentum, we also find the opposition forces now resorting to new stratagems to prevent its realization.

I note from the press reports from Albany, N. Y., that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey is busily engaged in encouraging the passage of resolutions in the New

York State Legislature to petition the President and the Congress to build the St. Lawrence power project and defer the seaway. I recall that during the Presidential campaign, when he came to Minnesota, he gave strong assurances that he is for the St. Lawrence seaway project, and if elected President he would vigorously press for congressional approval of the project. But, of course, Albany is not Minnesota, and we hear a different tone now since the Presidential campaign is over.

My friends in both great parties realize, however, that for the first time in the history of the country we have a President elected with the support of the Western States who has unequivocally stood for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to benefit the whole Nation, regardless of sectionalism. In fact, for the past 25 years no President has been elected to office who has not strongly and unequivocally supported the construction of this project for both power and navigation.

Needless to say, this Congress should not entertain any idea of following Governor Dewey's suggestion to develop power alone, for the following reasons:

First. As proposed by Governor Dewey, if St. Lawrence power alone is developed, the project will cost \$49,000,000 more to the people of the State of New York and other Northeastern States, thereby increasing the cost of power developed to industries and consumers. It is not to the interest of the northeastern part of the United States to support this proposition. The Governor has kept this fact from the people of the State of New York.

Second. It is unfair to mislead the public of New York and other Northeastern States with the false hope that they will secure the power project without navigation, as both the Canadian Government and our own Federal Government have commitments and agreements for the joint development of the project. And those arrangements cannot be changed without years of delay and without welshing upon promises made to the people of this country and of Canada. I am sure that the Federal Government will not go back on its word and any false expectations aroused to the contrary merely mislead the public and play into the hands of the minority groups who oppose this great development.

Third. On account of the critical situation arising in the exhaustion of our raw materials upon which the industry of the Middle West and the whole country depend, the St. Lawrence seaway is just as vital to national interest as the power, hence no leader who only recently presumed to represent the country as a whole can, in good conscience and with frankness, propose the indefinite postponement of the seaway in order to satisfy minority pressure groups in New York and other Eastern States.

At a time when the press of the country is applauding the initiative taken by this country in support of democratic principles all over the world through economic and technical assistance, it is inconsistent to close our eyes to the greatest development within our grasp, which

will make the North American Continent a strong and a better place in which to live.

Recently, Defense Minister Claxton, of Canada, gave a speech at Sault Ste. Marie, on January 11, emphasizing the importance of the joint seaway power development in the defense of the North American Continent, from which I quote in some length:

#### THE PLACE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Here we are, 1,500 miles from the sea at one of the four main junctures of Canada and the United States across the mighty St. Lawrence system. The foresight and cooperation of Canadians and Americans built the locks which opened the waterways system from Fort William to Sarnia and joined Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron into the greatest inland area of deep-water transportation on the face of the earth. What this single engineering job at the Sault has meant in profit to the people of Canada and the United States is impossible to calculate. More tonnage passes through the Sault Ste. Marie canals than through the Panama and Suez Canals combined, and this despite the short season.

The way opened here was extended by other canals on through Lakes Erie and Ontario, down the St. Lawrence as far as Prescott, adding 500 miles to deep-water inland navigation.

Now there is only the part from Prescott to Montreal blocking the flow of deep-water trade and travel from Lake Superior out into the oceans of the world.

You will recall that it was during the darkest days of the war that President Roosevelt and Mr. Mackenzie King worked out again an agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. The project was advocated as a great contribution to the peaceful life and trade of this continent, and it was planned as a definite line of communication for the defense of our continent.

If it was desirable in 1941 that we should construct the waterways for purposes of transportation and for power, recent events have shown that it is even more desirable today; if it was desirable to proceed with the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway for purposes of defense in 1941, nothing that has happened since has in any way diminished that need.

In the interest of national defense and international security the St. Lawrence waterway project should be started as soon as possible and pressed to completion. General economic benefits, transportation and communication, power, and iron ore are reasons which give the completion of the St. Lawrence urgent priority in joint defense. Let us examine each of these:

1. The completion of the waterways system, like every other major development of transportation and power, would lead to the expansion of the civilian economy, and any expansion in the industrial and economic potential which in peacetime leads to prosperity and a higher standard of living also leads to an increased ability to arm ourselves for our own defense. Here, in this home of steel, there is no need to remind you of what Hanson Baldwin said, that it was "the factories of America, the industrial know-how of America, and the mechanical competence of America \* \* \* that won the war."

2. In the modern war the lines of communication stretch all the way from the battle front to the factories and the full use of the St. Lawrence would bring resources of the interior of our continent closer to any possible fighting front; it would permit the more effective mobilization of the industrial potential of the continent; it would make possible the construction of all but the

largest vessels in the industrial centers of the Great Lakes; it would provide a means of transportation alternative to the railways.

3. We saw in the last war how important an element was water power. You may remember how it led us in 1942 to build at Arvida a plant bigger than Boulder Dam in a little more than a year. The United States and Canada need the full power potential of the St. Lawrence now.

4. The completion of the waterways would make it possible for the great resources of iron ore in northern Quebec and Labrador to be made safely available to the smelters of Canada and the United States.

This matter has already received the attention of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense. Ordinarily its recommendations are not made public, but this was of such interest that the recommendation of the Board in May 1947 was put in evidence by General Marshall at a congressional hearing. The Honorable James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense of the United States, gave evidence of the need for the project.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Governments of the United States and of Canada, accepting the advice of their principal military and civilian advisers, are pressing for authority to proceed with the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway as a combined power and navigation project in the interests of prosperity in peace and security in war.

This speech by Defense Minister Claxton indicates the thinking of most Canadians—it shows that our neighbors to the north share the views of most Americans who today recognize the material benefits to be derived from the navigation and power facilities of the St. Lawrence project.

In addition, they agree with most high military officials in America that the seaway is an important link in our joint national defense system. For the seaway would provide both countries with a great inland water route protected against enemy submarine and air attacks in case of war—it would make available new and protected shipbuilding facilities where ocean vessels could be assembled and floated directly to the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, every postponement of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project robs America of a valuable natural asset. The seaway will open the world's market to Midwest farmers, and stimulate commerce and trade between the east coast and the Great Lakes areas. It will provide vast quantities of cheap electric power to power-starved New England. It will directly benefit half of America, and indirectly the whole Nation. It will contribute to our national defense.

The people of the Midwest have dreamed of the day when the seaway would become a reality. Forty years is long enough to wait for this development which represents their hopes and aspirations for the good life. It is far too long to have permitted the railroad and the power lobby to block a program of utmost importance to the general welfare. It is my hope that the Eighty-first Congress will set aside any narrow sectionalism that may exist, and forget all false fears that seaway will damage any region or any American industry, and take action to enact this resolution into law.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] on his able and skillful presentation of the case for the St. Lawrence seaway. I find myself in complete agreement with what he has said. I sincerely hope that the resolution which the gentleman has introduced, and which I have the honor to introduce a twin to, will soon be before the House, and that we will have the privilege of bringing to a realization this great dream that so many people have had of a very important means of strengthening our entire St. Lawrence and Great Lakes regions, and at the same time strengthening the national defense of the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]. I am more than happy to welcome his support in the sponsorship of this very important resolution.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include testimony of Dr. John D. Clark before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. Boggs of Delaware, for February 16, 1949, on account of attendance at funeral services.

To Mr. CARLYLE (at the request of Mr. KERR), for the 15th and 16th, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

To Mr. TAYLOR, for indefinite period, on account of illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

221. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed Economic Stabilization Act of 1949, together with a summary of the proposed bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

222. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for further contributions to the international children's emergency fund"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

224. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to destruction of letter

boxes or mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, particularly with respect to harbor of refuge at Lester River, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2626. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building construction industries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 782. A bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: H. R. 2720. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRYSON: H. R. 2721. A bill to extend certain provisions of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER: H. R. 2722. A bill to amend section 144, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for transfer of proceedings before United States district court judges by reason of bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON: H. R. 2723. A bill to authorize a temporary program of Federal aid to public-school agencies for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEWART: H. R. 2724. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2725. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN: H. R. 2726. A bill authorizing the completion of certain works of improvement in the Red River of the North drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, in



the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining research station in the vicinity of Missoula, Mont., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2728. A bill making any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2729. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland of certain land situated in Greenbelt, Md.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2731. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2732. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of \$60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 2733. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2734. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing law; against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2735. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2736. A bill to subject Indians and Indian reservations in the State of Wisconsin to the laws of the State, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2737. A bill to establish the decoration Medal for Humane Action for award to persons serving in or with the armed forces of the United States participating in the current military effort to supply necessities of life to the people of Berlin, Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2738. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2739. A bill to promote and maintain amicable relations between the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and the employees in the field service of the surface and air postal transport by the establishment of a board of arbitration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 2740. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON (by request):

H. R. 2741. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide a 20-percent increase in survivor benefits to widows, children, and parents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2742. A bill to amend and reenact sections 4F, 4G of title 30, United States Code, act of May 7, 1941, chapter 87, sections 1 and 2, 55 Statutes 178, relative to the appointment of coal-mine inspectors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2743. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privilege he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Madison, Wis., as the Richard Bong Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2745. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2747. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to, or on account of, the children of persons who served in the active military and naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2749. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2750. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2751. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527, 43 U. S. C. sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2754. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2755. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2756. A bill to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution amending Public Law 49, chapter 87, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, so as to provide that whenever a Federal coal-mine inspector finds that imminent danger to the employees in the mines exists, he shall immediately order the operating manager or his representatives in the mine to cause all employees to be withdrawn from the unsafe area until such imminent danger is removed; and providing a penalty for refusal of such operating manager or his representative to obey such order; and providing that nothing in such amendment shall be construed to operate to nullify any existing contract between mine employees and mine management, or to nullify any existing State statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the disposition of certain Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to protest the arrest of Protestant clergymen by the Government of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 103. Resolution providing for the employment of an additional expert transcriber in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 104. Resolution providing for additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 105. Resolution expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives with the victims of the Carbondale Township, Pa., mine cave-in; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their resolution regarding means of attaining a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of the Fisher Brewing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Morris Zucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Reno E. Stutely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertrude Mulders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

78. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, not to enact legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States of the Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

79. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners and the mayor and council of the city of Hoboken, N. J., urging President Truman to protect against the communistic travesty of justice and morality such as imposed on His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

80. By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the North Dakota Legislature, requesting increased Federal participation in the construction of approved hospital projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

81. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul C. Emple, executive director, National Lutheran Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proposed legislation before the Congress affecting the entry of displaced persons into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of compassion and deliverance, we thank Thee for Thy promise: If any man lack wisdom, let him ask Thee.

In this moment of prayerful quietness we would again take the pledge of service we owe our country. We pray Thee to confirm that which is good in us, and rebuke that which is foolish.

While we value the counsel and fellowship of our comrades in service, yet we know that, as individuals in the hands of a good God, we cannot be all things to all men, but true to Thee and our consciences. Free us from the fetters of our old selves, and help us to stand erect for the truth and right. Lead the way, O Lord, and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2313) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, reversing the right to object, may I say as a member of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means that this was considered by the full committee and there was no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles (other than copper sulfate) entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1949, and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "March 31, 1950" and insert "March 31, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H. R. 2313 is to continue for another 2 years the suspension of the import tax on copper. In 1947 the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings at which the critical shortages in the supply of copper for American industry were described. The Honorable Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, has advised the Committee on Ways and Means that there have been no major developments which would indicate any substantial change in the production of, or the civilian demand for, copper and copper products for some time to come.

We are confronted, therefore, with the identical problem that we faced 2 years ago. Present production of copper in the United States is insufficient to meet the demand. In fact the demand for 1948 was roughly 400,000 short tons in excess of domestic supply. As a result of this critical supply situation not only industry consumers of copper but also the producers have joined in the support of the pending legislation. Continuation of the suspension of the import taxes on copper has been urged by manufacturers of products used in such varied industries as the automotive, electrical equipment and appliances, housing and construction of all kinds, shipbuilding, telephone and public utilities, and other basic industries. A brief submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of more than a dozen of the principal domestic copper producers stresses that the present abnormal demand is temporary, resulting from the unsatisfied civilian requirements of the war years and of the requirements of the Economic Cooperation Administration and Government stock-piling for defense. The domestic producers agree it is necessary to suspend the import taxes, but they want a time limit of 2 years placed upon the suspension.

In addition to the endorsement of producers and consumers of copper, the interested governmental agencies have expressed their support not only in the interest of meeting the quantitative requirements of industry and the national defense program but also in maintaining the current price of copper and thereby providing an anti-inflationary effect. The Secretary of Commerce advised the committee that should the import taxes in question be restored at this time, it is certain that the price of copper would rise still further, having an inflationary effect on the American economy.

## DIVISION OF WATERS OF COLORADO RIVER

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.